UNITAS

"Clamat Ecclesia ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."
— S. Augustine.

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Association *Unitas*

ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDITION

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY
RIVER FOREST, ILLINOIS

Editorial

Charles Boyer, S.J.: Ecumenism and Conversions.

Joseph Gill, S.J.: Lambeth 1948 and the Theology of Orders.

P. S. Sakash, S.J.: Sts. Cyril and Methodius and the Origin of the Romano-Slavic Rite.

E. Goudal: Where is Integral Christianity Found?

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS: The Sovereign Pontiff's Theological Thought, Charles Boyer; Pastoral Letter, Cardinal Agagianian.

NEWS: American Chronicle, Msgr. McMahon; Around the World; Oriental Church.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, N. Y.

VOLUME 1 APRIL-JUNE, 1949 NUMBER 2

Nihil obstat:

Charles Boyer, S.J.,

censor deputatus

Imprimatur:

✠*Aloysius Traglia*

Archiepūs Caesarien. Vicegerens.

Ex Vicariatu Urbis, die 9 iv '49.

On the Occasion of Pope Pius XII'S Fiftieth Anniversary of Sacerdotal Ordination

I have often been granted the joy of hearing genuine Protestants praise the reigning Pope and speak of him with profound respect. Doubtless, they thought that their words were limited to the person. I wonder if they are quite sure. Are they not moved as well by the office when they contemplate the one who bears the charge of all churches and whom an unbroken succession links with the fisherman of Galilee to whom Christ said, "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and again, "feed my lambs—feed my sheep"?

Whatever the case may be, it is quite clear that many dissidents of the Orient and the Occident no longer see in him the foreboding figure that they did in past centuries. If they still refuse to recognize the fullness of his authority, it is rather because of historical or theological reasons which they believe to be well founded, but which they feel are daily dwindling away.

How can one help but recognize the essential service which the supreme pontifical office renders to humanity? Even without calling upon its divine origin, or the necessity of its presence to guarantee the Church's unity of faith, is it not the Papacy which gives us the most solid grounds for consolation in these troubled times—the blessing of a serene voice which can soar above our tumults, speak justice and invoke peace, and to which the peoples harken as to the voice of their own conscience?

Should that voice be pleading the cause of the unhappy souls whom the war has plunged into misery, whom we call refugees, victims, or displaced persons; should it be summoning those invested with the charge of public welfare to the work of material and moral reconstruction; or should it be protesting against acts of violence—as it did when it vindicated human and sacerdotal dignity outraged in the person of Cardinal Mindszenty, and aroused a like indignation in all honest hearts: it is always the voice of the spirit and the Gospel's true echo.

Unitas, whose road is lighted by precise pontifical directions while it labors to bring our separated brothers back to Unity, wishes to commemorate this jubilee date. It offers filial homage to him who is the visible principle of Unity, and who, when speaking of the aspiration of both Catholics and non-Catholics toward unity in the faith, cried out: "but who could feel this desire more keenly than the Vicar of Christ himself?"[1]

The Editor

---

1) Message to German Catholics assembled at Mainz, *Osservatore Romano,* Nov. 9, 1948.

Ecumenism and Conversions

On Corporate Reunion

In the intention of its authors and promoters, ecumenism has always been a movement destined to unite (or at least to tend to unite) the different Christian "churches" in one sole Church of Christ.[1] *A Catholic ecumenism* will then look toward a return of the separated Oriental churches and the Protestant communities to the Roman Church. It is not addressed directly to individuals, but to those bodies of which the individuals are members.

On the other hand, it frequently happens that isolated non-Catholic Christians ask to be received into the Catholic Church. What effect does the return of these individuals have upon a corporative return: are they an obstacle, or an aid, or an accident without appreciable influence? Herein lies a complex problem which all do not solve in the same way, and which, nevertheless, must be well solved if the work of union is to be fruitful. Many think that individual conversions and unionism or "ecumenism" are incompatible. Some among these, believing in the utter impossibility of reunion according to whole bodies, oppose unionistic movements because they believe them to be harmful to individual conversions. Others who have been won over to ecumenism fear that individual conversions are an impediment to the union of large bodies.

We shall begin with the consideration of this latter position. Pastor Max Thurian, of the Reformed Community of Cluny, recognizes that some conversions become a matter of obligation but adds, "Even so, we ought to regard these individual cases with sorrow, recalling that they create within a given circle (family, friends, parish) obstacles which are difficult to overcome."[2] Pastor Thurian develops his idea further and holds that corporate reunions constitute impediments to the movement toward unity. Such would have been the case, according to him, if the Malines conversations had succeeded and a part of the Anglican Church had reunited with Rome. The departure of a few, should it be as a group, indispose those who remain, and cause them to stiffen their position. Those advancing toward unity must move ahead all together and with an equal step. One reads in the life of Newman what apprehensions, what sadness, and what bitterness were caused among the Tractarians themselves by the numerous conversions from among their ranks.[3] There are even some who recognize the Catholic Church alone as the true Church who look without sympathy upon the return of individuals. They think that converts immediately lose all influence upon the group which they leave, while, if they had remained, they would have influenced it favorably. Spencer Jones was of this opinion. He urged his own coreligionists to recog-

1) Cf. Charles Boyer, *Le probleme de la reunion des chretiens*, Unitas, Dec., 1947 (Italian ed.), and *The Amsterdam Assembly and the Ecumenical Movement*, Unitas, Jan.-Mar., 1949 (English ed.).

2) *Chretiens devant l'oecumenisme Catholicite*, July, 1947, p. 27.

3) Cf. W. Ward, *The Life of J. H. Card. Newman*, London, 1927, especially Chap. 3, p. 79 ff.

nize the authority of the Roman Church, but believed that he himself should remain an Anglican, as indeed he died at the age of 86. They had separated as a body, and as a body they should return.

There are those who do not believe at all in corporate conversions; that is, those made as a body. Their whole hope and effort is directed toward individual conversions, which they see as being regretfully delayed or impeded by the illusion of an imminent collective reunion. One reason that the English Catholics in general pronounced themselves hostile to the conversations of Malines was that they expected the number of individual conversions to decrease because of them.[4] It seems to me that to arrive at a rational solution of the problem, the following questions must be answered:

1. In what measure may one hope for a return as a body of separated Christians to the unity of the Roman Church?
2. Are individual conversions an obstacle to this return?
3. Is the fear of retarding the unity of all Christians a reason for delaying the conversion of even one soul?

First of all, may one reasonably hope for a proximate reunion of all Christians in the unity of the true Faith? We have no intention of placing limits upon the power of divine grace, but if one is to judge according to what we may observe at this hour, there appears to be no likelihood that such a happy event is near. The divergences are too deep and too varied to disappear completely in a short time. Yet one may consider certain particular bodies among them as separate from the others and estimate with some probability the likelihood of union they offer.

If, for instance, one considers those separated Christians whom Pius XI called "those venerable Eastern Christian communities"[5] one finds reasons militating in favor of their re-entrance into Catholic unity which are so cogent that one may hope for it without temerity. The most probable supposition would be that some one of the autocephalic Churches, or at least some important group from a Church, ask to be united without waiting for the others to accompany it.

In such a case we would have more properly a union as a body, or "corporate" in the sense that the Church which becomes united remains itself, losing only its state of schism. In fact, Fr. Jugie has recently maintained that the separated Oriental Churches, recognizing themselves as being unable to define anything since the separation, can without denying themselves renounce

---

4) Cf. J. de Bivort de la Saudee, *Anglicans et Catholiques*, Paris, Plon, 1949, p. 216.

5) "Le venerabili cristianita orientali conservano una tale veneranda santita di cose che meritano non solo tutto il rispetto, ma anche la simpatia." *Discorsi agli Universitari*, Quaderni universitari, IX, Studium, 1932, p. 28.

their erroneous opinions, accept the entire Catholic doctrine, and consequently become Catholic as Churches.[6]

Protestantism is too divided to be considered as a whole. At least as regards the matter under discussion, one is obliged to say as much of the whole body of Christians grouped under the name of Church of England.

As a matter of fact, it has been maintained that the Church of England could effect its reunion as a body; that is, without abandoning its own principles. Rev. Paul Wattson, S.A., founder of the Octave of Prayer for Unity, in his Anglican days defended this particular thesis with his friend Spencer Jones.[7] These authors asked why, if the Church of England today affirms its continuity with what it was before the Reform, it should not place itself again in dependence upon Rome as it was before Henry VIII. Newman, on his part, attempted to give a Catholic sense to the Thirty-nine Articles, which it will be recalled are not irreformable. The fact is that the continuity of the Anglican Church has been broken in many ways. Whatever the case, a return to Rome on the part of all who belong to the Church of England, including those who are now flirting with modernism, is extremely improbable.

However, within this large community there are parties and smaller groups also for whom accession to full Roman and Catholic unity seems clearly to be the logical conclusion of their recent history.

The Anglo-Catholics, who number perhaps a half million,[8] and certain still more Romanizing communities are on the road, whether they are aware of it or not, which since Newman's time leads to Rome. Groups are likewise found among the Lutherans and Calvinists who seem to be troubled by a longing for true unity. While the reunion of such groups would not be the reunion of Churches, it could, it would seem, be considered as "corporate," that is, made as a body.

Therefore, in our opinion, it would be an error to consider the strict sense of the term "ecumenism" as merely Utopian, when conceived of as the return to the faith, if not of all the dissidents, at least that of numerous Christians acting as a body. (It is not our intention here to speak of "ecumenism" in the sense of a mere search for mutual comprehension, understanding and good relations among people of different confessions.)

Wherefore, there is reason, in certain cases, for taking into consideration a possibility of corporate reunion, and for inquiring whether this possibility should be a motive for delaying individual conversions. To respond, one may

---

6) Martin Jugie, A.A., *Ou se trouve le Christianisme integral? Essai de demonstration Catholique*, Paris, 1947.

7) *The Prince of the Apostles*, Graymoor, N. Y., 1905, p. X ff.; p. 22.

8) This is the figure given by T. Whitton, *The Necessity for Catholic Reunion*, London, 1933, p. 124.

8a) In 1933, the Rev. T. Whitton wrote these grave words: "The prospect of the future of the Anglo-Catholic party, and of the Anglican Church as a whole, without Catholic Reunion can only inspire dismay and dread in the mind of one who loves them." The Necessity for Catholic Reunion, London, 1933, p. 11.)

on the one hand hold as conceded that an apostolate inspired by wisdom looks to the most universal good, and that it may, when the attainment of that good requires it, refrain from activity directed toward a lesser good. This is a choice between two goods and which bears upon the greater of them. Therefore, in the case of a general movement which would present a fair likelihood of success, and this in a rather short time, it would be prudent not to seek the attainment of isolated conversions, *if these should halt the general movement.*

But there still remain two points to be clarified. When a soul is convinced that the true Church of Christ is the Roman and Catholic Church alone, may it be dispensed from demanding reception into that Church by invoking the reason that it would be more useful outside it for the sake of hastening the return of an entire community, or of an entire denomination, or even of a whole Church? The answer must be *no*. First of all, there is true disloyalty in wishing still to appear that which one is no longer, and to use this false appearance to influence others. Furthermore, and above all, charity certainly begins with one's self. Our soul is confided to ourselves before other souls are confided to us. We must obey Christ to save ourselves. One does not obey Christ if one keeps himself outside the Church which he knows Christ founded. It is plainly this thought which Newman wished to express in concluding his *Essay on the Development* with these words: "Time is short and eternity is long."

Wherefore, in the case of conflict between individual conversions and returns made in a body, the doctrine seems clear to us. The apostolate may bear upon the return of the greatest number, but when an isolated conversion has matured nothing permits its delay.

The other question, an extremely important one, is this: is there truly a conflict between individual conversions and corporate conversions; that is, in the concrete, between conversions and "ecumenism"? We believe that this is to be denied. Paul Thurean-Danjin likewise denies it in his biography of Cardinal Vaughan. He writes, "Was it then in arousing souls to a desire for union with Rome and in accustoming them to the idea of a reconciliation with the Pope that conversions were checked? If, perhaps, these conversions were suspended for a moment, a state of mind had been created, nevertheless, which would activate them later. Experience, moreover, bears this out: were not a number of converts enlisted from the former 'unionists'?"[9]

Let it be well noted, though, that the conversion of any body of Christians indeed supposes the conversion of each member of that body. An action should then be exercised which is of a nature to bring about a change in each one of the souls. This action is doubtless accompanied by other influences which affect the whole body. While it remains in harmony with

9) Paul Thurean-Danjin, Le Cardinal Vaughan, Paris, 1911, p. 82.

them, these influential factors cannot substitute for a direct approach to the individual souls but at most favor its effect.

There is also the point of view of right. In the case of a spiritual event, only legitimate dispositions are to be considered, which are those resulting from good will. In the case of the Oxford Movement, for instance, one certainly understands the sorrow, the temptation to anger, and the discouragement which the Tractarians experienced in seeing a good number of their companions in combat leave their ranks to pass into the Catholic Church. But, upon reflection, they should accept the sentiments of Pusey and deny nothing of the road which they had made together with those who now separated. To become spiteful, turn back, refuse to remain in or enter into a movement simply because others who were of it did something which displeased would mean falling from that state of good will which is always to be supposed when a matter of salvation is at stake: "*Omne quod non est ex fide peccatum est.*" (Rom. 14;23)

According to right then, individual conversions ought not to impede the unionistic movements.[10] But may one not go a step further and maintain that, in fact, instead of halting them, they rather favor the group movements and cause them to proceed toward their proper end? The same Oxford Movement offers an example. It is sometimes said that Newman brought it to a halt. Was it really this movement which halted? That which really came to an end—and that not because of Newman's conversion, but because of the Anglican authorities' refusal to enter the way of Tract 90—was the association of a group of courageous and talented men who until then had labored together. That which ceased, or rather was diminished, was the great number and celebrity of conversions. But can we believe that Anglo-Catholics would exist at all today, and these even so in considerable number, if there had been no Oxford Movement? The movement has been transformed, one may say, but perhaps it bears within itself no less unionistic promise than it did then.

In turning toward the present situation of the Christian world, we might well order our thoughts in the following way: The greater part of "ecumenists" acknowledge that their movement cannot succeed without the collaboration of the Roman Catholic Church. The conferences of Lambeth have explicitly declared this on several occasions; Fr. Florovsky said it again last August at Amsterdam: "No true ecumenical cooperation, no true Christian community, no true reunion of Christians can be realized if Rome cannot be included."

This was the idea of Spencer Jones in his famous book *England and the*

10) Cardinal Rampolla had this same opinion when he wrote to Lord Halifax: "It is not correct that at Rome there is no wish for union as a body but that one is limited to desiring individual conversions; it is only true that one does not wish hindrances to the more proximate and easier realization of individual conversions while union as a body is being dealt with." (Il n'est pas exact qu'a Rome on se borne a desirer des conversions individuelles, ne voulant pas l'union en corps: il est vrai seulement qu-on ne veut pas d'entraves aux conversions individuelles, dont le succes est plus proche et plus facile, tandis que l'on s'occupe de l'union en corps. Halifax, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*, London 1912, p. 351.)

Holy See, whose thesis Msgr. Hawks resumes thus: "If there is to be reunion, it cannot take place without the cooperation of Rome; but Rome cannot change without ceasing to be *Rome;* we, however, can change and do change; therefore let us change."[11] But the Catholics know, as do the non-Catholics, or moral, and that consequently the only means of including Rome in a reunion of Christians is to accept her Faith integrally. The result is that Catholics must hold—and the non-Catholics understand that they hold it—that the concrete and real end of unionistic movements is the acceptance by all Christians of the Catholic Faith. With this understanding, the fact that certain ones arrive first at their destination cannot impede others from continuing their journey.

Let us see things as they are in actuality, and in this Catholic review, let us see them from the Catholic point of view. We have admitted the possibility of a rather proximate return of certain separated groups. As regards the others, and these are numerous, one may only speak of hope according to a distant perspective. There is more than one leader of the Ecumenical Council who does not see union of all Christians in one faith before the Last Judgment.[12] In any case, the probability is that this unity is still far off. What motive remains, then, for delaying individual conversions to favor ecumenism?

On the contrary, how not to see what great benefit these conversions bring to the cause of true unionism? A conversion gives cause for reflection; it obliges one to question himself; it gives courage to the timid; it clarifies the way for many. When converts stand in the public light for reason of their virtue, their talent, or their position, they so attract by their example that they become capable of liberating a whole movement of conversions. Even in the case of those movements of corporate reunion which promise completion in a near future, we may suppose that nothing would hasten them more than the realization of individual conversions en masse.[13]

Fr. Paul, founder of the Franciscan Friars of the Atonement, who had for a time hoped for the corporate reunion of the entire Church of England, and who after his conversion envisaged another sort of corporative reunion in small groups, recognized also the legitimacy and the importance of individual conversions: "We must not depreciate or seem to disparage the individual process of convert-making. We are much too grateful for our own admission that the Church of Rome cannot renounce anything which constitutes dogma to the Fold of Peter not to stretch out a loving hand to every individual soul, who is contemplating the same step."[14]

---

11) Edward Hawks, *William McGarvey and the Open Pulpit,* Philadelphia, 1935, p. 99.
12) Cf. Charles Boyer, *The Amsterdam Assembly and the Ecumenical Movement,* Unitas, Jan.-Mar., 1949, p. 9.
13) Rev. T. Whitton writes: "It is by the reunion of the party as a whole by Corporate Reunion, if possible, or *en masse,* that the conscience of England is to be touched." *The Necessity for Catholic Reunion,* p. 135. This book shows clearly the necessity, the difficulties, and the means for this reunion.
14) *The Lamp,* Sept., 1948, p. 331.

We would, to be sure, be the first to demand of the Catholic apostolate that it avoid in its activity all that could legitimately vex the spirit. Prudent zeal gains a hearing. No one can be offended in seeing a Catholic explain his faith with serenity and courtesy, clarify the contested points, or showing the baselessness of objections and prejudices. If an appeal is made to history, let him take care to say nothing which is not correct. Evidently, one is not obliged to sing the praises of those who brought the separations about, but they must be spoken of without any injustice. The more one guards against any air of superiority in controversy, and the urge to personal triumph, and the more one shows himself concerned uniquely with the work of light and charity, the less will he arouse ill-feeling and antagonism.

In making these reflections, we have not only held strictly to Catholic ground, but we have maintained the most exigent concept of "ecumenism," namely, that which wills unity of faith at whatever cost.

A more pragmatic "ecumenism," which is that of a great number, consists in a spirit of comprehension, of understanding, of kindness, even in controversy, and even in dogmatic opposition. I have said nothing against this "ecumenism" which I regard as founded in view of, and as a preparation, perhaps indispensable, for a reunion of Christians in the unity of faith. One should merely recommend to such "ecumenists" not to consider this ideal as something ultimate, because, conceived in this wise, it would favor confusion and religious indifference. Since "Ecumenism" is a movement of charity, it must of its very nature proceed until it reaches the full accomplishment of Christ's will.

Charles Boyer, S.J.

Lambeth 1948 and the Theology of Orders

The question of Orders has always loomed large in the relations of the Anglican Communion with other religious bodies. Recognition of their ordinations was the immediate goal of their negotiations with the Orthodox Churches in the twenty years following the 1920 Lambeth Conference. The impossibility of reconciling Anglican views on episcopacy with those of the Free Churches of England was the obstacle that could not be surmounted to achieve Home-Reunion in the same Conference. It is still the main difficulty that besets various members of the Anglican Communion trying to combine with other ecclesiastical bodies, whether on the larger scale of union and intercommunion or on the smaller of united evangelical effort, as is manifested in the review of such schemes as are now in progress given in the Report on "the Unity of the Church" of the Lambeth Conference of 1948.

That conference was faced by a new factor in the shape of the Church of South India—an amalgamation of four Anglican dioceses with the Presbyterian, Congregationalist and Methodist Missions of the area—inaugurated in September 1947 and so now no longer mere theory but fact. The Church of South India is not within the Anglican Communion—not even the former Anglican dioceses are now Anglican: it is a separate Church on its own.

The Lambeth Conference of 1930, even though foreseeing the certain secession of those four dioceses from its own fold, blessed and encouraged the project. When later misgivings were felt about certain doctrinal and administrative parts of the scheme, the Committee of Theologians appointed to examine it in 1946 by the Archbishop of Canterbury, still did not condemn it, though it drew attention to several points where it hoped for amendments, e.g., concerning the official attitude to the Creeds; the teaching on the sacraments and particularly on the need of Confirmation; the future relations with non-episcopal Churches and with ministers, not episcopally ordained, who might enter it.

But the main rock of offense is still the question of the ministry. For the inauguration of the new Church composed as was said above, of four diverse elements—Anglican, Presbyterian, Congregationalist and Methodist, of which the last three do not have an episcopally ordained ministry and do not admit episcopacy as being anything more than one possible method of Church organization, the way of unifying the ministry was this:

All the accredited ministers of all the uniting bodies, whether episcopally ordained or not, were recognized as ministers of the new Church as on an equal footing. Seven members of the non-episcopal bodies were consecrated bishops by the uniting Anglican bishops according to an ordinal in every important particular identical with the Anglican rite. All future ministers are to be episcopally ordained, so that it is hoped that at the end of a period of some thirty years the whole ministry of the Church of South India will be episcopally ordained. The Lambeth Conference of 1948 had to define its atti-

tude to the new Church, the first ever to have achieved union between episcopal and non-episcopal elements which is rapidly becoming the model—though with various modifications—for other similar schemes in many parts of the world.

What would have been highly desirable, to say the least, would have been for the Lambeth Fathers to have first defined the Anglican position and faith about Orders and, in particular, about episcopacy. That they were not able to do. There is, it is true, apropos of "any Anglican approach to Unity," a section (p. 50)[1] entitled "Theological principles." These are the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, viz. (1) The Scriptures as the rule of faith; (2) The creeds as its sufficient statement; (3) The two Gospel sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and (4) A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body . . . with the last element interpreted as the episcopate as alone capable of providing the kind of ministry desirable. But when the section goes on to expand this last idea, it has to record divergent views within the Anglican body and the assembled bishops. All adhere to the principle enunciated in the Preface to the Ordinal whereby only those episcopally ordained may minister to Anglican faithful. The divergence lies in the views on the nature of episcopacy: "Some, holding episcopacy to be of the *esse* of the Church are bound by their convictions to hold that non-episcopal ministries are not ministries of the Church. . . . Others, while holding firmly that episcopacy is the normal method for the transmission of ministerial authority, yet feel themselves bound, in view of the manifest blessing of God on non-episcopal ministries, to recognize those ministries as true ministries and their sacraments as true sacraments. Yet others hold shades of opinion intermediate between these views. . . . But room must be left for varying interpretations of the fact of episcopacy, provided that the historic succession is maintained, and that the functions of the episcopate are such as have been traditionally assigned to it." (page 50)

This difference of theological opinion could not help but be reflected in the attitude of the Conference towards the Church of South India whose present members were classified in three categories:

(1) ex-Anglicans, whether bishops, priests, deacons or laity;
(2) other members of the Church of South India whose antecedents were not Anglican and who have not been episcopally confirmed or episcopally ordained to the ministry;
(3) those who have been consecrated to the episcopate, ordained to the presbyterate or to the diaconate, or as lay persons episcopally confirmed, at or since the union. (p. 46)

About the attitude to be adopted to the first two of these categories

1) Page references within the text of this article are to the official account of the Conference entitled "*Lambeth Conf.* 1948" (London 1948).

there was no difficulty; it had already been established at Lambeth 1930 and elsewhere.

It is in relation to the third category, those consecrated and ordained within the Church of South India, that certain difficulties arise. "It is not difficult to declare that the orders and ministry of the Church of South India are regular and valid so far as regularity and validity can be guaranteed by 'the form and manner' used in consecrating and ordaining. . . . But it remains true that form and manner alone are not sufficient to guarantee the character of a ministry. That can be substantiated only by the faith and practice of the Church itself. We find that no one of us desires to condemn outright or to declare invalid the episcopally consecrated and ordained ministry of the Church of South India.

"Most of us, having taken into account the official documents of the Church of South India, and its life, in so far as it has become known to us, rejoice that we are able and feel bound here and now to accept the Church of South India as a living part of the one holy, catholic and apostolic Church of Christ, to recognize bishops and presbyters consecrated or ordained in the Church of South India as true bishops and presbyters in the Church of Christ, and to recommend that they be accepted as such in every part of the Anglican Communion, subject only to such regulations as are normally made in all such cases by the responsible authorities in each area.

"Others . . . hold that it is not at present possible to make any definitive judgment on the Church of South India and its ministry. The Church of South India is very young. . . . They are of the opinion that time must be allowed for that Church to grow into fuller unity and to manifest its stability and its validity as a living part of the body of Christ. They are unable therefore to associate themselves with any such recommendation as that indicated in the preceding paragraph." (pp. 47,8)

Such is the wording of the Report of the Committee of 66 Members appointed to study "The Unity of the Church." Both of the above views were embodied in the Resolutions, which alone are the authoritative statement of the whole Conference:

54(e) "In regard to the bishops, presbyters, and deacons consecrated or ordained in the Church of South India at or after the inauguration of that Church, the Conference is unable to make one recommendation agreed to by all. It therefore records the two following views:

"(1) One view (held by a majority) that such bishops, presbyters, deacons should be acknowledged as true bishops, presbyters, deacons in the Church of Christ and should be accepted as such in every part of the Anglican Communion. . . .

"(2) Another view (held by a substantial minority) that it is not yet possible to pass any definite judgment upon the precise status of such bishops,

presbyters and deacons in the Church of Christ or to recommend that they be accepted in the Anglican Communion as bishops, presbyters or deacons.

"The conference records the fact that no member of the Conference desires to condemn outright or to declare invalid the episcopally consecrated and ordained ministry of the Church of South India. . . ." (p. 39):

It has been necessary to give both statements verbatim because for some months after the end of the Conference there was a lively correspondence in the *Church Times* on what precisely was intended by the opinion of the "substantial minority"; the views of the majority are plain. Among other things light was thrown on the relative strengths of the "majority" and the "substantial minority." It appears that, in the voting of the full Conference on Resolution 54(e), out of all the 329 assembled bishops 97 abstained from voting and the rest were divided into the majority of 135 and the "substantial minority" of 94, so that the majority was not a majority of the full Conference but only of those who voted. What does the opinion of the minority amount to? In the Report of the Committee, "That it is not at present possible to make any definitive judgment on the Church of South India and its ministry" and that it could not associate itself with the recommendation of the majority. That recommendation was that the bishops and presbyters of the Church of South India should be accepted as true bishops and presbyters by the Anglican Communion.

The minority could not agree with that recommendation presumably because it had doubts as to whether those bishops and presbyters were indeed true bishops and presbyters. The official Resolution 54(e) is more exact in that it states, "It is not yet possible to pass any definite judgment upon the precise status of such bishops, presbyters, and deacons in the Church of Christ." In other words "the substantial minority" was not yet certain that the newly consecrated and ordained bishops and presbyters of the Church of South India were, in fact, bishops and presbyters at all in the Church of Christ. Unless the words "precise status in the Church of Christ" mean that, it is hard to conceive what they can mean.

It is true that both the Resolution and the Report of the Section record that "no member . . . desires to condemn outright or to declare invalid" those Orders, but as the Rev. T. Jalland pointed out (*Church Times,* Sept. 3, 1948), that is not as definite as "was not prepared to condemn outright, etc. . . .," a phrase used by the Bishop of Derby (the president of the sub-section that dealt with the Church of South India) in a letter to the *Church Times* (Aug. 28, 1948) as an equivalent. It is consistent with being "prepared to condemn outright, etc.," though with reluctance.

It is not hard to see why the "substantial minority" is so hesitant in its attitude to the Church of South India. It is not satisfied with the doctrinal teaching of that Church and particularly so with regard to its ministry. For

example, the Constitutions of the Church of South India, in accepting the Creeds "do not intend thereby to demand the assent of individuals to every word and phrase in them." "For the sacrament of Confirmation there may be substituted a service of admission to full communicant-status, but not a sacrament. As we have seen, it counts equally as presbyters those episcopally ordained and those not episcopally ordained. Even with regard to the new bishops and presbyters episcopally ordained, drawn from non-episcopal antecedents, it may legitimately be asked whether they really think that ordination by a bishop gives them anything more than what they had before and whether they have not accepted the laying-on of episcopal hands merely to promote unity within their Church.

Even so, one is inclined to think that the view of the majority which is ready to accept the Church of South India in its present state as a "living part of the one holy, catholic, and apostolic Church of Christ" is from a strictly Anglican point of view, the more logical. For the Anglican Church prides itself on its comprehensiveness or ability to countenance within itself wide divergence of opinion even on basic matters. Pretty well every year the Modern Churchman's Union denies some part of the Creed. The official Report on *Doctrine in the Church of England* records serious differences on e. g. the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, the Sacraments, etc. Lambeth 1948 itself stated that there was no agreed belief on the necessity of episcopacy.

So that the Bishop of Derby could with some justification write that the Committee "reached by an overwhelming majority the conclusion . . . that the standard of actual orthodoxy prevailing among its members (i.e., the Church of South India) is likely to be at least as high as that obtaining among the members lay or clerical, of any member-Church of our own Communion." (*Church Times,* Oct. 8, 1948.)

Nevertheless one's sympathies lie with those who, as they would probably prefer to see a greater uniformity of belief within their own Communion, are anxious to prevent a decision by which their Church would formally countenance the further anomalies to be found in the Church of South India.

"The conference declared emphatically that the episcopal orders and ministry of South India are valid so far as regularity can be guaranteed by the 'form and manner' used in consecrating and ordaining. . . ."

The report, however, goes on to say, "But it remains true that form and manner alone are not sufficient to guarantee the character of a ministry. That can be substantiated only by the faith and practice of the Church itself." In a real sense this last quotation summarizes the attitude of Lambeth toward South India "better than any other one in the report."[2] Elsewhere in the Report of the Committee the same idea is expressed as follows: "None of us hold that actual succession and correct formulae of ordination can guarantee

2) From an account by Bishop Fenner of Kansas (U.S.A.) written for *'The Living Church,'* Sept. 12, 1948.

a true and effectual episcopate or presbyterate apart from the faith and corporate life in which they are set" (p. 63). There seems to be a distinction between "formal validity" and —?— Is this an idea learnt from the Orthodox Churches? For they, before they gave their recognitions "by economy" to Anglican Orders, made some enquiry into Anglican belief, especially as regards the sacrament of Orders itself and Holy Communion; and, last year during the sittings of the Lambeth Conference, Moscow refused a like recognition till such time as it was convinced of the general orthodoxy of Anglicanism. But the positions of the Orthodox Church and of the Anglican Church are not the same. The former believes that she constitutes the one Church of Christ to the exclusion of all others and that outside of her there are no effective sacraments since she is the sole steward of divine grace. The latter believes that she is not more than one part of the true Church of Christ, the rest of that Church being made up of the Orthodox Church, the (Roman) Catholic Church and (for most Anglicans) the Free Churches.

For Anglicans, then, the steward of divine grace would have to be the "Church of Christ." Is then, the idea underlying "it is not yet possible to pass any definite judgment on the precise status . . . in the Church of Christ." That, though the Orders of the Church of South India are canonically "accurate," they must be made effective (? be economy of a sort) by the Church of Christ and that this validity will ensue (automatically and retrospectivley?) only when there is no further doubt on the doctrinal position of the Church of South India?

When I first read the reports of the Lambeth Conference of 1948 very shortly after they first appeared, an idea immediately jumped to my mind that has only strengthened since. If the members of the "substantial minority" had lived in Rome in the latter half of the 16th century, what would have been their views on the "precise status of the bishops, presbyters and deacons of the Church of Christ" of the Church of Cranmer, Parker and Whitgift? They would have had serious doubts about its orthodoxy for its official formularies would have savoured to them of heresy.

Its articles said strange things, at least on the Councils of the Church and the Sacraments. It had a new liturgy—"It is *not* a disordered attempt at a catholic rite, but the only effective attempt ever made to give liturgical expression to the doctrine of 'justification by faith alone.' " [3] It was not, even, as if it had an Ordinal they could approve of, for the compiler of the liturgy had drawn up also a new Ordinal in the same spirit. It is true that it had not accepted as its "presbyters" the non-episcopally ordained with the episcopally ordained.[4] But its Primate could write: "If it had pleased her majesty, with the wisdom of the realm, to have used no bishops at all, we could not have

3) Dom Gregory Dix: *The Shape of the Liturgy* (2nd edit.) London 1945, p. 672. The italics are in the original.

4) He did even that on occasions, provided that the non-episcopally ordained were not Englishmen who had gone abroad for the specfic purpose of getting non-episcopal ordination.

complained justly of any defect in our Church" (Whitgift, Archbp. of Canterbury 1583-1604).

The more that was learned by report of events in England, the greater the misgivings aroused: spoliation of monasteries; persecution and hangings of "massing-priests"; destruction of altars and images; Lutherans and Calvinists vying for control; the monarch head of the Church and effectively interfering in its life. Would the "substantial minority" have felt that it was yet possible to pass any definite judgment on the precise status of its bishops, presbyters and deacons? And has the situation changed very much since in the Anglican Church at large, apart from the cessation of persecution?

* * * *

Attached to the Report on "the Unity of the Church" is an appendix on the theory of "Supplemental Ordination." It is not part of the Report proper but is given so as to promote thought and study.

The most significant result of the conferences between the Anglican and Free Church representatives during the years 1921-25 was the recognition on the Anglican side that the Free Church ministries are "real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church." The exact meaning of that phrase has never been defined by either side, but both Free Churchmen and (at least evangelical) Anglicans understand by it that Free Church ministers do not differ from Anglican ministers in any essential respect as regards their powers. "We conclude therefore that there is nothing in the Church of England standards to suggest that the Anglican ministry is 'priestly' in any sense which would make it different in kind from the Free Church ministry of the Word and Sacraments."[5] The former are commissioned without episcopal laying-on of hands to serve one body of Christians: the latter with episcopal laying-on of hands to serve another. The Anglicans hold that episcopacy and episcopal ordinations have been part of the normal life of the Church from the earliest times. It is a rule of order in the Anglican Church that none but those episcopally ordained shall minister to Anglican faithful. When two such Churches, one with episcopacy and the other without, are working out plans of union, the greatest difficulty is always the question of the ministry. Each recognizes that the other has a "real ministry of Christ's Word and Sacraments": yet the ministers of the one may not serve the faithful of the other. To get over the difficulty there has in practice been proposed the use of "supplemental ordination," viz., that some (or all) of the ministers of each Church should be ordained also in the rite of the other Church so that they may be given, in addition to whatever their original ordination conferred, that something which the other Church has and their own may lack. It is a practical expedient to meet the situation that has arisen since the Reformation when Christianity was divided into so many "splinter-

5) *The Scheme of Church Union in South India.* A Statement of 23 Evangelical Anglicans, p. 42. London 1942/4.

Churches," and it is obvious that such a solution could be entertained only by Churches that do not think of themselves as the sole Church of Christ but only as parts of it. But practice cannot be divorced from theory and this Appendix to the Report on "The Unity of the Church" is an attempt to measure up the theory against the practice.

The appendix records two views, the one outlining theological principles that would make "supplemental ordination" both intelligible and justifiable, the other leading to an opposite conclusion.

The second view (to deal with that first as being the more familiar) is that implied by Catholic doctrine. Theology knows of "conditional ordination" and of "supplying the ceremonies" if perchance some usual and prescribed, but non-essential, ceremony has been omitted in the conferring of Orders.

In neither case could there be any question of the bestowal of the characteristic grace of ordination, either in whole or in part, if it has been once received. "The theory of 'Supplemental Ordination,' however, appears to imply that the grace of ordination, the bestowal of the Apostolic commission, has in fact been efficaciously received on a previous occasion. 'Something' is now being added to it by the 'Supplemental' rite. But what *can* conceivably be added to the substance of the Apostolic commission?" (p. 65) "Supplemental ordination," then, would be either a reiteration of a previous ordination (which no one could allow) or else an ordination *de novo* (which neither participating Church would admit in its own case). If the practice is meant only to convey a wider jurisdiction, then "supplemental ordination" is a misnomer and the ceremonies proposed to effect it misleading.

The first view cannot be expressed better or more succinctly than in the actual words of the Appendix:

"Ministers (it is argued) are members or organs of the Body of Christ, and as such act representatively on behalf both of Christ the Head and of the Church which is His body. They may be said to act as the agents of Christ-in-His-Body. They require the commission alike of Christ and of the Church, and the ordination whereby each minister is commissioned must be unmistakably the act of Christ-in-His-Body, or else it may be doubted whether he is endowed with the grace and the authority requisite for the Office he exercises. His ordination can only be beyond question if it is carried out by those who themselves have unmistakable authority from Christ and the whole Church to give such a commission on behalf of Christ-in-His-Body. . . .

"The division of the Church, at any rate from the Reformation, resulted in their being no longer any ordaining organ able so to act on behalf of Christ and the whole Church. It may be held that non-episcopal ministries have the commission of Christ and of their own parts of the Church; but it cannot be said that their ordaining agents act on behalf of the whole Church.

Similarly it may be held that the episcopal ministries have the commission of Christ of their own parts of the Church; and that the episcopate *ought* to be the ordaining organ of the whole Church. . . . The most we can say, therefore, for any ministries in the divided Church is that they carry a commission conferred by Christ in and through part of His Body, but not the whole. This is an anomaly which follows from the greater anomaly of a divided Church. It may be that God, in His mercy, makes up all that appears to be deficient in ministerial grace and authority; but the fact remains that *at least* the form of ordination is defective in that it is not conferred unmistakably by Christ and the whole body: and that no Church can be completely assured that its ministers have the fullness of grace and authority until this defect is made good. "What, therefore, is needed by all ministries is a supplemental ordination which, without denying the reality of previous ordination by Christ in part of His Body, shall confer all that may be lacking of grace and authority through the failure of the whole Body to associate itself with the previous ordination." (pp. 64/5)

The roots from which this theory has sprung go back a very long way into Anglican history. The doctrine of the "divine right of kings" in matters both civil and ecclesiastical, dominated Anglican thought at least till the reign of James II (1688). That the king was head of the Church was no fiction for the earlier generations of Anglicans nor did they think him a mere figure-head with only a kind of token authority so that there was no hesitation in allowing the monarch the right to make bishops in the same way as "the apostles and others unto whom God had abundantly given His Spirit sent or appointed ministers of God's word." (Archbp. Cranmer) The same Cranmer, the first Archbishop of Canterbury in the Church of England, wrote: "All Christian princes have committed unto them immediately of God the whole cure of all their subjects, as well concerning the administration of God's word for the cure of souls as concerning the ministrations of things political and civil governance." And later in the same document, "A bishop may make a priest by the Scripture, and so may princes and governors also, and that by the authority of God committed to them. . . . In the new Testament he that is appointed to be a bishop or a priest needeth no consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointing thereto is sufficient. . . . It is not forfended by God's law (that the King should make bishops)." Archbishop Whitgift in the quotation given above (p. 11) goes even further and he adds: "For, if it had pleased her Majesty to have assigned the imposition of hands to the deans of every cathedral church, or some other number of ministers which in no sort were bishops, but as they be pastors, there has been no wrong done to their persons, that I can conceive."

And so the Anglican tradition goes on through the 16th and 17th centuries, showing itself in its attitude to the continental Reformed Churches that had no bishops, that, as episcopacy was found in the Church from the

earliest times, it should be used where that was possible, but where circumstances had rendered that impossible Anglican divines were unwilling to "un-church" their fellow-Reformers for the lack of it. "I bless God that I was born and have been bred in an episcopal church; which I am convinced has been the government established in the Christian church from the very time of the Apostles. But I should be unwilling to affirm that where the ministry is not episcopal, there is no church, nor any true administration of the sacraments." (William Wake, Archbp. of Canterbury, 1716-36).

It was, then, no break with Anglican tradition that prompted the words of the "Appeal to all Christian People" of Lambeth 1920: "It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communions which do not possess the episcopate. On the contrary, we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace"—an admission whose logical consequence was the acknowledgment of non-episcopal ministries as "real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church."

But there was something new in the same Appeal's offer: "We believe that for all, the truly equitable approach to union is by way of mutual deference to one another's consciences. To this end, we . . . would say that if the authorities of other Communions should so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, Bishops and clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. . . . It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship."

No official document tries to define further the phrase "real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments" as applied to Free Church ministries but it is commonly implied that they labor under some defect which may be in "the sphere of faith or discipline and also in the sphere of ministry" (to use the words of the Anglican Committee responsible for both phrases in the Conferences with the Free Churches of 1921-25). That, presumably, would be made good, at any rate "in the sphere of ministry," by an episcopal laying-on of hands. But the readiness of Anglicans after Lambeth 1920 to accept a reciprocal commission from the Free Churches implies that thereby they would receive something they have not yet got. Yet they had till then held that their Orders bestowed everything that Orders ever gave in the primitive Church. What is it, therefore, that they expect to receive?

The theory of "supplemental ordination" outlined above is a tentative answer. But it is hard to see how it can be very satisfactory to a theologically-minded Anglican. He would claim that by this Anglican ordination he re-

ceived power to confer such sacraments as only a priest can give, to preach the word of God and to minister to souls—but, he would say, only in the Church of England. If he upheld "supplemental ordination," he would probably grant that non-episcopal ministers have just the same powers, but only for their own Churches. What he is striving for is the commission and right to exercise those powers in the Universal Church, or in such part of it as are willing to unite, ordination being considered as *ipso facto* conferring jurisdiction. "The Catholic Church is neither wholly a matter of the future nor is it present in all its fullness in a divided Christendom. It is a matter of greater or less approximation to its undivided state. . . . The traditional view of the ministry does not altogether cover such a situation and it is unrealistic to treat it as the final arbiter in the unprecedented situation of the reintegration of such splinter Churches."[6]

The same writer answers the question: "What could I, an Anglican, receive from supplemental ordination from the Free Churches?" as follows:

"(a) At present I am stopped from exercising my ministry among the Free Churches not merely out of loyalty to my own Church, nor merely because such jurisdiction as I have received does not extend to their denominations, but because I do not consider myself ministerially commissioned to serve them.

"(b) At an Anglican ordination the laying-on of hands does not merely confer commission to exercise a contemporaneous ministry. It is also the reception of a tradition of ministry which, because of the possession of the apostolic succession by our own Church, makes the recipient heir of an historic succession of ministering. In a great act of Supplemental Ordination, I should become by the same method of laying-on of hands heir to other traditions of ministering to which I am at present a stranger, owing to the divisions within the Body of Christ."[7]

But what is a "tradition of ministering"? The writer obviously visualizes more than minor differences of rite and customary ways of thought. But does he mean more, at bottom, than the right to minister to other flocks, viz., an extension of jurisdiction? And if that is all he really means, then the Anglican and the Free Churches are in an impasse. For the laying-on of hands by a bishop is, in Anglican eyes, more than a mere granting of jurisdiction: it is a real ordination that confers the powers of the ministry. Yet, without the episcopal laying-on of hands the Free Churches, by reason of the injunction of the Prayer Book, may not serve Anglicans but because they already have and are acknowledged by Anglicans to have, "real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments," they cannot accept it except at the cost of re-ordination and a "repudiation of their past ministries."

Joseph Gill, S.J.

---

6) H. E. W. Turner: The Theory of Supplemental Ordination, in *Theology*, Feb. 1949.
7) Ibid.

Ss. Cyril and Methodius and the Origin of the Romano-Slavic Rite

THE GREEK LITURGY OF SAINT PETER AND THE ROMANO-SLAVIC RITE

In the last three decades a number of Cyrillo-Methodian problems have found a more or less definite solution. Among these is the question of whether or not Cyril (+869) and Methodius (+885) introduced the Slavonic language into the *Roman* rite, and by what right they would have done so. This question has been discussed and argued for a long time, but until now it has not been clarified.

Besides the Byzantine-Slavic rite in use among the Catholic and separated Slavs, there is also a *Romano-Slavic* or Glagolithic rite which still exists today in certain Croatian dioceses and in the Croatian Province of the Third Order Regular of St. Francis.[1] In the Middle Ages this rite was still more widely diffused among the various Croatian regions, as it was in Bohemia, where it enjoyed a period of flowering in the tenth and eleventh centuries.[2] No one doubts any longer that Cyril and Methodius translated the Greek liturgical books along with the greater part of Sacred Scriptures into Slavonic in the beginning of their apostolate in Greater Moravia (863-867). The analysis of the ancient liturgical texts concords with historical evidence to prove this. They were authorized by the Emperor Michael III and by the Patriarch Photius who had not yet severed their relations with Pope St. Nicholas I when the Byzantine mission left for Moravia in 863. Later, in 868, these books were blessed at Rome by Pope Hadrian II.

Although there has been no difficulty in admitting these things, the problem of the Cyrillo-Methodian origin of the *Romano-Slavic* rite has always remained rather obscure. Added to the internal and external difficulties of the problem itself, objections have been brought against it by the defenders of the Croatian Glagolithic traditions of long standing. These are admitted even in some pontifical documents which affirm their rite derives from that great doctor of the Church, St. Jerome (+420). Ten years ago, Reverend professor Cherubina Shegvic again attempted to give new foundations to this tradition which has already been rightfully abandoned by others. He denies precisely that Saint Cyril was the inventor of the so-called Glagolithic writing, and that he was the translator of the liturgical text of Latin rite.[3] However, when this study appeared, Msgr. Joseph Vashitza, professor of the University of Prague, brought forth new and truly convincing argu-

---

1) For the present state of the Romano-Slav rite, cf. Prof. Ch. Shegvic, *Le origini del rito slavo-latino in Dalmazia e Croazia, Ephemerides Liturgicae*, LIV, Rome, 1940. pp. 40-42.

2) Jelie, L. *Fontes historici liturgiae glagolitico-Romanae a XIII ad XIX saeculum*, Veglae, 1906. *"Le vicende della Liturgia Romano-Slava" presso D. Cuniberto Mohlberg: Il messale glagolitico di Kiew . . .*; Atti della Pont. Ac. Rom. di Archeol. (serie III), *Memorie*, vol. II, pp. 296-309. *Sulla liturgia romano-slava in Boemia:* Chaloupecky V., Prameny X., *Stoleti . . .*; *Svatovaclavsky Sbornik*, II, 2. Prague, 1939, pp. 401-454.

3) Shegvic, Cherubino, *Le origini . . .* (cf. Note 1), pp. 38-65. The weak side of this article is the ignorance of the recent results of Cyrillo-Methodian studies which exclude the suppositions and deductions of Shegvic.

ments in favor of the thesis that the real initiator of the Romano-Slavic rite was in fact St. Cyril of Thessalonica.

To prove his argument, he collected the results of important critical research which he corrected, completed and illustrated. He based his work on the studies made, on the one hand by Dom K. Mohlberg, O.S.B. (1927), and Msgr. Joseph Vajs, professor emeritus of the University of Prague (1939) on the dependence of *the most ancient Romano-Slavic texts (Pages of Kiev* and three *Glagolithic Croatian Missals)* upon the Sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great (+604) and on the other hand by H. W. Codrington and J. M. Hanssens, S.J., on the *Romano-Greek Liturgy of St. Peter.*[4] The careful linguistic, liturgical, and historical analysis of these texts, which until recently had remained rather enigmatic in many respects, gave unhoped for light both on the existence and practice of the Liturgy of St. Peter and on the origins and development of the Romano-Slavic rite. Before presenting a synthetic exposition, we shall say something on these individual texts and studies.

The Glagolithic Pages of Kiev form a small book in parchment, containing 14 pages on which are written 38 liturgical prayers of Latin rite, belonging to 10 different Mass formularies (e.g., St. Clement). The Russian Archimandrite Atoninus had acquired them in the Holy Land, no one knows how. He made a gift of them to the Theological Academy of Kiev in 1872 whence the name by which they are now known. Various Slavonists, and especially V. Yaghitch, have made a paleographic and linguistic analysis which shows that these pages were transcribed in Bohemia in the tenth century from an archtype of the ninth century, and that they form the most ancient known example of the Slavonic, so-called Glagolithic writing. The first page had been left vacant in Bohemia, and was filled in toward the end of the eleventh century in Croatia. From thence the little codex was taken in some unknown way to Palestine. The Latin source of these prayers were sought for in vain for more than fifty years after the discovery. It was Mohlberg who in 1926 discovered their dependence upon the first *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesia* edited by Gregory the Great. He found it in the Codice D 47 of the Capitular Library of Padua which he had brought to light shortly before. After examining these Glagolithic prayers and considering them in the light of the data furnished by the two ancient (Slavic) Lives of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, he arrived at the hypothesis that St. Cyril had taken them from and translated them from a Sacramentary of St. Gregory during his sojourn at Rome in 868. This Sacramentary had already become antiquated in Cyril's time, and was no longer in common liturgical use.

4) Vashica, Jos., *Slovanska liturgie sv. Petra; Byzantinoslavica,* VIII; Prague 1939-1946, pp. 1-51, 52-54; *De liturgia Sancti Petri Slavica* (Summarium). Idem: *Slovanska liturgie nove osveltena Kijevskymi listy.* (The Slavic liturgy newly illustrated by means of the Pages of Kiev.) *Slovo a Slovesnost,* VI, 1940, pp. 65-77. Vajs, Jos., *Liturgia sancti Petri slavica* (Relatio). *Acta Acad. Velehr.,* XIX, Olmutz, 1948, pp. 110-115.

5) Mohlberg, D. Cunibert, *II messale glagolitico di Kiev* (sec. IX) *ed il suo prototipo romano del sec. VI-VII, Atti della Pontif. Accad. Romana di Archeologia* (Serie III). *Memorie,* vol. II, Roma, 1926, pp. 207-310, with Appendix (the text), pp. 310-320, and fac-simili: Plates XXII-XL.

Moreover, he suspected that these pages constituted a fragment of the *variable* parts of the Glagolithic Cyrillo-Methodian Missal. This last conjecture of Mohlberg aroused the scientific curiosity of Msgr. Vajs, one of the most profoundly learned scholars in Glagolithic Croatian codices. It put him to searching for Cyrillo-Methodian traces in the *invariable* parts of the old Glagolithic missals. He examined carefully the *Canon of the Mass* in the most ancient Glagolithic Croatian missal (Codex Illyria 4, of the Vatican Library) and found that from the lexicographical and morphological point of view it should date from the Cyrillo-Methodian period. Also the text, with the exception of certain variant readings, corresponded to the Canon of the Codex of Padua. Wherefore he deduced that the conjecture of Mohlberg was correct, namely, that a *complete* Slavic version of the Sacramentary of St. Gregory must in fact have existed in Moravia in the ninth century.[6]

In the meantime interest in the mysterious liturgy of St. Peter had arisen. The Canon of this liturgy *(anaphora)* falls within the framework of the Byzantine liturgy, while the Preface and certain other of its invariable prayers come from the *Latin* missal. Codrington had published the various texts, and had attempted to clarify the origin and nature of this curious liturgical phenomenon.

Here was a clear manifestation of the pious Greek Orient willing to meet with the Latin Occident upon the altar under the patronage of St. Peter, and to be fused into one with it in the unbloody Eucharistic Sacrifice.[7] Shortly after, Fr. J. M. Hanssens, S.J., undertook the analysis of the texts which Codrington had published. He added contrary conclusions to certain important points.[8] However, both are in accord in admitting that there exist three Greek versions of the Liturgy of St. Peter: Grottaferrata, Calabria, and Macedonia, or better, Mount Athos. Two translations belong to the Mount Athos version: the Georgian and the Slavo-ecclesiastic.

These two studies of the Liturgy of St. Peter, in particular, the clear affirmation that a special Macedonian or Mt. Athos type existed, gave rise to a new and decisive turn to the study of the Romano-Slavic rite's origin, The Mohlberg publication of Codex D 47 of Padua had, already in 1927, inspired Prof. A. Baumstark to liturgical and historical research work. He had stated as probable the idea that St. Cyril had translated not the Latin liturgical books then in use at Rome, but rather those more ancient ones of Illyria in the East. Although at that time he did not know that the *Pages of Kiev* depended upon the *Sacramentary of St. Gregory,* it was precisely the Slavonic text of the Liturgy of St. Peter and the Glagolithic *Pages of Kiev*

6) Vajs, Jos., *Mesni rad charvatsko-hlahol, misalu Illir, 4 a jeho pomer k moravsko-pannonskemu sakramentari stol. IX.* (Ordo missae of the Croatian-glagolithic Missal Illyria 4 and its relation to the Moravian-Pannonian Sacramentary of the Tenth Century. *Acta Acad. Velehr.*, XV (1939), 89-141, with fac-simili.
7) Codrington, H. W., *The Liturgy of Saint Peter,* with a preface and introduction by Dom Placid de Meester, O.S.B., *Liturgiegeschichtlichen Quellen und Forschungen,* Heft 30, Munster i. W. 1936.
8) Hanssens, J. M., *La liturgie romano-byzantine de Saint Pierre, Orientalia Christiana Periodica,* IV; Roma, 1938, pp. 234-258; V, 1939, 103-150.

which had suggested this idea to him. He thought that it would be useful to subject all the Glagolithic liturgical tradition to a thorough examination according to its relation to the single ancient texts as well as to the age and character of their Latin archtypes.[9]

The seed sown by Baumstark bore excellent fruit. The following year Mohlberg largely clarified the mystery of the Glagolithic Pages of Kiev, and ten years later Msgr. Vajs recognized the Canon of the *Sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great* in the most ancient Glagolithic Missals. Then the studies of Codrington and Hanssens on the Liturgy of St. Peter and its various types determined Prof. Vashica to make a scientific examination of the *Slavonic translation of the Liturgy of St. Peter* which had not been sufficiently examined by the former two scholars. He had the fortunate idea of comparing its Canon with the Glagolithic Canon of the *Codex Illyria 4* which had already been examined by Vajs. The result was surprising. Those few variant readings which in this Glagolithic Canon did not correspond with the Latin Canon of Codex D 47 of Padua, he found in the Canon of the Macedonian version of the Liturgy of St. Peter, both in its Greek text and in the Slavonic and Georgian translations. Furthermore, he found some purely Byzantine formulae and expressions in the *Illyria 4*—a sign, in case of doubt, that it was not translated from the original Latin, but from the same *Greek* archtype of the Liturgy of St. Peter from which spring the Mss. of the Macedonian type; two Greek, two Georgian, and one Slavonic. He also noted that in the Slavic *Life of St. Methodius* (Chap. XI) it is stated explicitly that St. Methodius, for a feast of St. Peter, celebrated precisely the Liturgy of St. Peter in Slavonic for the Prince Svatopluk and his army. Consequently, the Slavonic translation of the liturgy of St. Peter, made from a *Greek* original, was already in existence. But who translated it, and *when*?

From his own observations, as well as those of Mohlberg, Baumstark, Codrington, Hanssens and Vajs, Msgr. Vashica made various deductions, which can be briefly summarized in this systhesis:

The hypothesis of Baumstark seems to be correct and well proven that in eastern Illyria, which comprises almost the whole Balkan peninsula, and which until 732 belonged to the Patriarchate of Rome, there existed along with the *Byzantine* formulary of the Holy Mass with the anaphoras of St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil, also a *Roman* rite formulary for the central part of the Mass, taken from the Sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great and translated into Greek. Because of its Roman origin, it was called by the Greeks the *Liturgy of St. Peter*. Since Sts. Cyril and Methodius were born at Thessalonica, where for four centuries the Archbishop had been Pontifical Vicar of eastern Illyria, they knew this sort of liturgy. Wherefore,

9) Prof. A. Baumstark, *Untersuchungen*, p. 34-35 (see asterisk). Second part of book—Mohlberg-Baumstark, *Die alteste erreichbare Gestalt des Liber Sacramentorum anni circuli der romischen Kirche* (Cod. Pad. D 47, fol. 11r—100r). *Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen*, Heft 11-12, Munster i. W., 1927.

when he arrived in Moravia and Pannonia, and found the Latin rite already in use among those Slavs who had already been baptized, *St. Cyril* translated for them *from the Greek* not only the Liturgy of St. Basil and of St. John Chrysostom, but also the *liturgy of St. Peter.*

This Slavonic translation, both the Illyrian and Macedonian, of the liturgy of St. Peter, along with the translations of other liturgical texts which occur in its celebration (e.g., the evangelarion), along with Byzantine-Slavic texts, was approved by Pope Hadrian II when he blessed it, first in the Basilica of St. Mary Major, and then in that of St. Peter. Vashica thinks that the first Slavonic Masses which St. Cyril's disciples celebrated at the beginning of 868 were performed according to the liturgy of St. Peter. These disciples had been ordained to the priesthood by the suburbicarian Bishops Formosus and Gaudericus. As Mohlberg had perceived, *to make variety possible* in the celebration, St. Cyril in that same year 868, made certain additions to the invariable schema of the liturgy of St. Peter which he had translated from the Greek. He added variant orations from the Masses of St. Clement (with preface and commemorations of the Roman martyr St. Felicitas), six ferial Masses (with preface) and some common Masses of the martyrs and *de Angelis,* which he translated rather freely from the Latin text of the ancient Gregorial missal which he had found at Rome. This work is preserved in the so-called Glagolithic *Pages of Kiev.* These pages, according to Vashica, did not form a fragment of the missal of St. Gregory the Great translated into Slavonic, as Mohlberg had believed, but rather an appendix—*a complement to the Slavonic translation of the liturgy of St. Peter.* A Slavonic translation of the *entire* Sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great had never been made as Vajs supposed.

The sole manuscript of the Slavonic liturgy of St. Peter is that of the Serbian Monastery of Chilandar at Mount Athos. It was written in the eighteenth century in the so-called Cyrillic ecclesiastical characters. According to this manuscript, Vashica observes, the Slavonic liturgy of St. Peter remained a true Mass destined to be sung publicly among the Macedonian Slavs, even after the Cyrillo-Methodian period. He deduces this, among other things, from the fact that those of its prayers which are sung by the priest in the Latin rite, are also divided according to the periods of liturgical melody. The Slavonists Sievers and Jakobson had already affirmed this in regard to the *Pages of Kiev* which are intimately connected with the Slavonic Liturgy of St. Peter. Then the linguistic examination of the manuscript of Chilandar revealed to Vashica two different strata of the ecclesiastical Slavonic language in it. While the prayers of the "Byzantine framework" correspond to the Serbian version of the ecclesiastical Slavonic found in other Byzantine-Slavic liturgical monuments of the eighteenth century, the central, or Roman part, is linguistically much more archaic. It is similar to the language of the Glagolithic Canon of *Illyria 4* and of the *Pages of Kiev.* This would indicate

that the Serbian monks, celebrating and copying the liturgy of St. Peter through the centuries, left more or less intact the language of the Latin rite prayers which were less familiar to them. On the other hand, they recited and transcribed the Byzantine liturgical formulae, which they knew from memory, in their contemporary liturgical language. These were formulae which derived in great part from the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. Some confused and corrupt passages occurring in the text of the Canon show, moreover, that the Byzantine-Slavic copyists of the later centuries were no longer able always to ascertain the exact sense of the archaic prayers which were of Latin origin. In regard to the Byzantine liturgical elements in that form of the liturgy of St. Peter which is preserved in the Chilandar manuscript, Vashica thinks that they are posterior to the Cyrillo-Methodian period. In fact, in the most ancient Georgian manuscript of the liturgy of St. Peter and in the Vaticano-Borgia Ms. of the eleventh to the twelfth centuries which derives from the same Greek archtype as the Slavonic translation, these errors are less numerous. Perhaps, then, they were entirely lacking or very few in the Cyrillic translation of the liturgy of St. Peter. It follows from all the above that the liturgy of St. Peter, transplanted by St. Cyril from Macedonia to Greater Moravia, returned to its land of origin and remained in use there at Mount Athos as a live and vivifying Cyrillo-Methodian heritage almost to the threshold of modern times.

We shall summarize what has been said up to this point. St. Cyril of Thessalonica, by translating the Roman-Greek liturgy, called "of St. Peter," from Greek into Slavonic, introduced the Slavonic language solely into that part of the Roman rite which belonged to the *liturgical patrimony* of his Macedonian homeland, and not into that which was then in use at Rome and among the already baptized western Slavs. He made this translation by right of that same patriarchal and imperial faculty that served him for the translation of the other Byzantine liturgical books for the use of the Slavs. Consequently, this work was carried out according to the ancient oriental practice of translating the sacred liturgical books into various national languages. *It was precisely this translation of the liturgy of St. Peter which brought the Romano-Slav rite into being, and which along with the prayers contained in the small Glagolithic codex of Kiev, formed its basis.*[10] Since St. Cyril was in the Byzantine liturgical region during the whole period of his work, he had no need of a pontifical permission. A breach was thus made in the Roman Church's constant practice of not permitting translations of the liturgy into barbaric languages. The way was then facilitated for St. Methodius, St. Cyril's successor in the Slavic apostolate, to make a great step ahead and obtain from the Holy See the faculty of translating *the whole contemporary Latin rite* into the Slavonic language. The fact that he

10) Sakash, Stef., S.J., *Il culto dei ss. Cirillo e Metodio mezzo efficace per promuovere il ritorno dei dissidenti all' unita della Chiesa.* Cf. Incontro ai Fratelli separati di Oriente, Roma 1945, pp. 500-503 (III: *I libri liturgici slavi.*)

had obtained this extraordinary faculty is attested by two pontifical letters. One is by Hadrian II, written in 869. Although it is preserved only in two Slavonic citations, doubt of its anthenticity is no longer possible. The other is by John VIII, *Industriae tuae,* addressed to Svatopluk in June, 880. We give here an abridged translation of the first letter, addressed to the Slavic princes Rastislav and Svatopluk of Czech and Slovak Greater Moravia, and to Kocel of Lower Pannonia (Slovenia) and of Savia (Croatia): ". . . We . . . decided . . . to send Methodius, after having consecrated him together with his disciples . . . into your regions, in order that he teach you, as you requested it, translating the books into your language according to the entire ecclesiastical order, fully and with the Mass . . . and with baptism, as the philosopher Constantine (St. Cyril) had begun it, with the help of God and with the prayers of St. Clement. Likewise, if another will be capable of translating worthily and with orthodoxy, may he be approved and blessed by God and by Us and by the whole Catholic and Apostolic Church, so that you may learn the precepts of God with greater ease. However, maintain the practice of reading in the Mass the Apostle and the Gospel first in Latin and then in Slavonic. . . ."[11]

This Pontifical letter not only illustrates splendidly the scientific conclusions of Mohlberg, Vajs and Vashica, but it also adds new force to their argument. Both the motive for the privilege conceded and the clause on the bilingual reading of the Gospel bear great significance on the liturgical sense of those distant times. The motive of the concession of the Romano-Slav rite throws into relief the exclusively apostolic purpose: ". . . so that you may learn the precepts of God with greater ease." The political motives which later had unfortunate effects upon this form of the Roman rite were foreign to the mind of the Pope as they were from that of the two Slavic Apostles. The clause on bilingualism which was repeated ten years later by John VIII, is in agreement with the frequent examples of the period's liturgical bilingualism. It was apparently inspired especially by a similar practice in the Church of Constantinople. According to the testimony of Pope Nicolas I, the Epistle and Gospel were read first in Latin and then in Greek on the occasion of the stations.[12] The purpose of this practice was doubtless the same as that for the present day custom of singing the Gospel in Greek as well as in Latin for the Papal Mass.[13]

From the year 869 to 885 Archbishop St. Methodius used generously the faculty which Hadrian II and John VIII had conceded him. Although it was prohibited in 873, it was renewed later. With the help of his disciples, he put himself to translating into Slavonic the liturgical books of Roman

11) Cf. Latin translation of Msgr. Grivec: *Vita Methodii*, cap. VII (*Acta Acad. Velehr.*, XVII, 1941, 114-115), or Dvorník, Fr., *Les Legendes de Constantin et de Methode vues de Byzance*. Prague, 1933; *Vie de Methode*, ch. VIII, pp. 387-388.

12) ". . . Istius enim linguae (i.e., latinae) Constantinopolitana ecclesia lectionem apostolicam et evangelicam in stationibus fertur primitus recitare sicque demum Graeco sermone propter Graeco utique ipsas lectiones pronuntiare. . . ." *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, Epist. VI, pp. 459-460.

13) Schuster, Card. Ild., *Liber Sacramentorum*, V., Roma 1923, p. 4. Petrani Alex., *De bilinguibus lectionibus liturgicis Collectanea Theologica*, XVIII, Lwow 1937, pp. 1-37.

rite then in use. To facilitate this work, wherever the Byzantine texts, either liturgical or Scriptural, which had already been translated, corresponded to the Latin rite, the translators simply copied them and transferred them just as they were into the Latin books. They did not concern themselves with whether they concurred exactly with the Latin original. *Byzantine infiltrations* in a number of Glagolithico-Roman texts are explained in this way. Their content ascends to the Cyrillo-Methodian period. For example, the Canon of the Mass of the Vatican Codex Illyria 4, was transferred to the Slavonic translation of the *contemporary Roman Missal* from the Slavonic translation of the *Greek* liturgy of St. Peter which had formerly been made by St. Cyril. Only in later centuries was there achieved a full, faithful concordance between the Croatian Glagolithic texts and their Latin originals. However, the liturgy of St. Peter continued in use at least sporadically alongside the ordinary Mass "*secundum consuetudinem Romanae curiae,*" both in Bohemia and in Croatia. It certainly existed in Bohemia up to the end of the tenth century when the small codex of Kiev was copied there. In Croatia it continued, without doubt, up to the end of the eleventh or twelfth century as is attested on the one hand by the Croatian addition in the *Pages of Kiev,* and on the other by the Glagolithic palimpset of Vienna of the twelfth century. This palimpset contains the remainder of three Masses *de Apostolis* which are very close in their content to the *Pages of Kiev* and to the ancient Sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great. Although no complete formulary is preserved of this Bohemo-Croatian form of the Slavonic liturgy of St. Peter, it can be said with certainty that the Byzantine elements were not so abundant as in the Serbian and Mt. Athos forms of the Mss. of Chilandar. From this fact it would appear that it must have been much closer to the Georgian form represented by the Vaticano-Borgian Mss. of the eleventh to the twelfth century. Perhaps a thorough examination of the Georgian Mss. will permit a more perfect knowledge of the original ensemble of this hybrid and syncretistic liturgical type in which the Orient and Occident, so to speak, lovingly embrace each other *in osculo pacis.*

It can be said that the mists in which the origins of the Romano-Slavic rite were enveloped have now dispersed. The venerable figures of the holy Slavic Apostles, Cyril and Methodius, with the great Pops Hadrian II and John VIII, appear distinctly upon the field. These latter had understood the missionary importance of their liturgical innovations and had supported, blessed and defended them. ". . . It is not at all inimical to sound faith and doctrine either to sing the Mass in the Slavonic language itself, or to read the Holy Gospel or divine lessons of the Old and New Testaments well translated and interpreted, or likewise to chant all the other lessons of the Office: because He who made the three principal languages, namely, Hebrew, Greek and Latin, also created all the others to His praise and glory. . . ." (John 8,14)

P. S. Sakash, S.J.

14) *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, Epist. VII, pp. 223-4; *Acta Acad. Velehr.* XVII, 1941, pp. 44-45.

Where Is Integral Christianity Found?

Concerning a Recent Book

Unitas readers will find special interest in a book of Martin Jugie which has recently appeared. It bears the title *Où se trouve le christianisme integral?* and the subtitle *Essai de démonstration catholique.*[1] Rev. Fr. Martin Jugie in this book has sought to renew that treatise which Catholic apologists usually entitle *De intentione verae Ecclesiae,* or *De demonstratione catholica.* This treatise deals with the discovery, by a method which is scientific and adapted to the subject, of which church among the presently existing Christian churches is the true Church founded by Jesus Christ. Formulated in these terms, the problem comprises only the Christian groups who hold a concept of the Church which is close to the Catholic concept, and who stand more or less explicitly as rivals of the Roman Church. These consequently admit:

(1) that Jesus Christ was sent by God and is God Himself.
(2) that He had the intention of founding a visible, unique and hierarchical religious society which He called His Church.
(3) that this Church was organized in fact according to His directions by the twelve Apostles with the assistance of the Holy Ghost.
(4) that this Church is indefectible and should last to the end of the world.

Supposing these things to be already accepted, the author envisages a limited discussion which includes only separated Orientals (Nestorians, Monaphysites, and especially Greco-Russians, or those who call themselves Orthodox) and at least that part of the Anglican Episcopal Church which is called *High Church* or specifically the Anglo-Catholic Church. Hence, one will not find in this work of Fr. Jugie any refutation of rationalist, liberal or modernist theories on the origin of Christianity. The author has in view, almost uniquely, the separated Orientals who constitute the largest group of dissident Christians, and the one which is closest to Catholicism. He may draw upon two common sources accepted as law by both parties, namely, the inspired books of the two Testaments, and the common tradition of the early Church up to the ninth century inclusive.[2] Indeed, it is commonly known that the separated Orientals refer to the doctrine of the early Fathers and of the seven first Ecumenical Councils in their discussions with Catholics. Fr. Jugie follows them constantly in this field. He tends at times to neglect occidental tradition in his effort to emphasize the teaching of the ancient Greek Fathers.

The Three Methods of Catholic Demonstration

From the time that the Catholic demonstration came into existence, that is, since the inception of Protestantism in the sixteenth century, Catholic

1) Paris, P. Lethielleux, 1947. 450 Fr, Octavo xxvi-276 pages.
2) In dealing with Nestorians and Monophysites, one may not go beyond the fifth century, since the former recognize only the two first Ecumenical Councils, and the latter the three first Councils up to the Council of Chalcedonia, 451, exclusively.

apologists have commonly employed the classical method, known as that of the four properties or notes of the Church. The properties are stated in the Creed of Nicea-Constantinople: *I believe in one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church.* The method can be summarized in the following syllogism:

Jesus Christ endowed His Church with four distinctive notes, namely, unity, sanctity, catholicity and apostolicity.

But among all the churches now existing, the Roman Catholic Church alone possesses these four notes.

Therefore, she is the true Church founded by Jesus Christ. The method appears at first sight to be simple and to furnish an incontestable argument. However, it meets with grave difficulties which Rev. Thils of the Catholic University of Louvain [3] has pointed out, as has Fr. Jugie after him. First of all, to clarify the Major, one must (1) define a distinctive note of the Church and establish its conditions, (2) state what each of the four notes of the Creed consists in and define it. However, it is not easy to do this for either the first or second point. Divergences on these definitions have arisen among Catholic apologists in the past and they still exist. These divergences have had their repercussion upon the formulation of the Minor of the syllogism. When the argument was first formulated, only the Protestants of the first hour were envisaged. It was then easy enough to give definitions of each of the four notes which made the Minor and the Conclusion legitimate. Later the dissident churches of the East and even certain established forms of Protestantism, such as Anglicanism and Calvinism, were taken into consideration. It then became apparent that the original definitions of the four notes, along with the conditions established for the notes in general required revision. Hereupon, notable divergences arose. Apologists began to speak of *positive* notes and *negative* notes. Some, and the greater number, declared, at least apparently, that the four notes given in the Creed were always *positive;* i.e., they were all the exclusive property of the Catholic Church and not in any way belong to the dissident churches. Others affirmed that sanctity alone was a positive note, and that the three other properties were *negative* notes; i.e., doubtless necessary for the true Church, but which might also be found among the false churches. Moreover, each of the four notes have been the object of multiple divisions and subdivisions. One author has succeeded in distinguishing as many as seven kinds of sanctity and fourteen kinds of catholicity! The demonstration has become so encumbered and obscured that it has become almost inaccessible to ordinary folk, whom the theologians call *rudiores,* but for whom it was intended as well as for the professional theologians. The scholars themselves lose their way among the many distinctions. Furthermore, it is not surprising that certain dissident theologians have accused the demonstration of arbitrariness, and have on

3) Gustave Thils, *Les Notes de l'Eglise dans l'apologetique catholique depuis la Reforme,* Gembloux 1937.

their side turned the same procedure against the Catholic Church by defining the four properties of the Creed in their own way.

Does this signify that this first method by the four notes is absolutely inefficacious and ought to be abandoned? Fr. Jugie does not think so. In the fifth and last chapter of his work he indicates a mode of utilizing it which removes that arbitrary character which its classical form seems to present. This mode consists in abandoning the way of absolute and exclusive affirmation in the Minor and substituting the comparative method.

One no longer says "The Roman Church is the *sole* Church to possess these distinctive traits of unity, of sanctity, of catholicity." Instead, one simply affirms, "The Roman Catholic Church possesses these distinctive traits *to a degree which is much superior to that which one can find in the other Churches.*" After this modification, does the Minor lead legitimately to the conclusion, *Therefore, the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church founded by Jesus Christ?* Fr. Jugie answers, "Yes, because Jesus Christ founded but one Church, and there is only one which is true. The true Church cannot be other than the most perfect, that which realizes best the qualities and conditions indicated in Scripture and Tradition.

One cannot consider the problem as settled. The inherent difficulty of the Major remains. It arises from the task of defining the four notes or distinctive properties. How to define them without resorting to the arbitrary? One will succeed if he will search for that idea which was commonly held in the Church on these four properties at the time when the Nicea-Constantinople Creed was composed; i.e., at the end of the fourth century. A historic research is required and in its large lines the author accomplishes it in his work. Evidently, in the fourth century all these distinctions, divisions, and subdivisions to which our modern apologists have accustomed us were not made. There was a current and simple notion of each of these four properties which one may find without difficulty in going through the works of the Fathers. Furthermore, Fr. Jugie affirms that the demonstration by the way of comparison and of transcendance would still be valid, even if the purely speculative *a priori* method is used to define the notes, that is, the method which present day apologists usually follow and which consists in exhausting by multiple distinctions the concepts of sanctity, catholicity and apostolicity. He states, "In fact, no matter what definitions one gives of unity, sanctity, catholicity and apostolicity, provided they deal with positive elements, of perfections which are exteriorly verifiable, the true Church will possess these elements, these perfections to a degree far superior to that which one can discover in the false churches."

Therefore, if the method of the four notes is subjected to the indicated modifications, a way of utilizing it exists. However, one must recognize that this method is of a very delicate nature. It remains long, difficult and hardly apt to make an impression upon the dissident Christians who are closest to

the Catholic Church. One need only recall the long research required to obtain a total idea of the phenomena of sanctity in the dissident churches of the East before approaching a comparison with the Catholic sanctity and a demonstration of the latter's superiority over the former.

In dealing with Greco-Russians and other dissident Orientals, one advances more speedily by employing the method called the *via primatus.* This is the path which leads directly to Rome. It consists in demonstrating by Scripture and ancient Tradition that the true Church founded by Jesus Christ necessarily possesses a primate, a visible head which was the Apostle Peter and is after him the Bishop of Rome who succeeds him in the primacy. This shorter method may be qualified as the *historic method,* because it consists entirely in demonstrating by historic facts and positive testimonies from the writings of the New Testament, the early Fathers and the first Ecumenical Councils. This evidence shows that Jesus Christ chose Peter as the visible Head of His Church, and that after the death of St. Peter at Rome, his successor on the Chair of that city inherited the primacy over the universal Church.

A third method remains which has been given the name of *empirical.* It has certain phases in common with the two others. This method consists in demonstrating the divine origin of the Roman Catholic Church through attentive consideration of that Church as it exists at the present time. This simple consideration, without any examination of the other Christian sects now existing, ought to lead the seeker to recognize that the Roman Church can only come from God, that it is marked with His seal, and that consequently one need only interrogate it about itself and receive its teaching as a divine message. The Vatican Council gave a brief account of this method in Chapter III of the Constitution *De Fide* where it is stated: "The Catholic Church, through herself, because of her admirable propagation, of her sanctity, and her unexhausted fecundity in all good works, because of her catholic unity and unconquered stability is a certain, great, and perpetual motive of credibility and incontestable testimony to her divine mission."

"This method," Fr. Jugie says, "approaches the demonstration by the four notes in the sense that it offers a certain official definition of these notes and circumscribes their significance. It is easy to find, in fact, apostolicity in the *unconquered stability,* unity in the catholic unity, sanctity in the *eminent sanctity and fecundity in all good works,* and catholicity in the *admirable propagation.* It also bears affinities with the historic method since, to appreciate the *unconquered stability* of the Roman Church, one must make an over-all view of her history. Likewise, her *admirable propagation* is an historic fact which obliges one to examine the origins of Christianity, unless he should understand merely the *present* propagation in space. The *fecundity in all good works* equally requires a minimum of historical information.

"In spite of its apparent simplicity, this method is not as easy as it

appears at first sight, because it requires not only research, but also extraordinary reflection and a very sincere love of truth. Indeed, one finds shadows in the picture when he studies the history of the Church. There are theories which give seductive naturalistic explanations. This demonstration would have no great effect upon those separated Christians who are closest to the Catholic Church, because they would be inclined to find easily in their respective churches, at least to a certain degree, the very marks of the supernatural which were indicated by the Council. The Greco-Russians, for example, would attribute to their church the *admirable propagation* of Christianity in the first centuries. They would speak of her *unconquered stability* in spite of the persecution of the first centuries, in spite of those which they have undergone beneath the Mohammedan yoke, and in spite of the recent hecatombs built by the Soviets in Russia.

"They would exalt the number, the splendor and the miracles of their saints, at least of those who lived before their separation from Rome, and whom they have in common with us. For them the historic method will always be the most appropriate." (p. xxiv-xxv)

The Method Followed by the Author

Hence, the author has chosen the historic method to answer the question *where is integral Christianity found?* As we have said above, he understands integral Christianity, as the Greco-Russians do with him, as being Christianity as it was found in the writings of the New Testament and in the Catholic Church of the first nine centuries. This accounts for his being led in the first chapter—which alone makes up about half of the work (pp. 1-136) —to give a brief description of the early Church according to the stated sources.

This description constitutes the Major of an argument which comprises the whole demonstration. It can be formulated thus:

According to the clear and precise testimony of the writings of the New Testament and the Tradition of the first nine centuries, the early Church was constituted by a number of essential elements which are enumerated, explained and demonstrated. (Chap. I)

But none of the present Christian groups separated from Catholicism possess these elements integrally; they all lack some of them. (Chap. II)

Therefore, the Roman Catholic Church *ought* to possess all these elements integrally, because the Church founded by Jesus Christ is indefectible, and she does possess them in fact (Chap. III) in spite of certain contrary appearances. (Chap. IV)

The essential elements enumerated in the Major are seven in number:

1. *Visible unity:* Jesus Christ founded but one Church, which ought to persevere in its visible unity until the end of time. This point is commonly admitted by the separated Orientals, and one might wonder why Fr. Jugie

thought it necessary to speak of it. The reason is that under the influence of the Protestant theory of the invisible Church and also of the theory of the union of churches upon the basis of the articles which are called fundamental, some notable dissident theologians declare that the visible unity of the Church founded by Jesus Christ disappeared in the ninth century. Since that time the true and universal Church would have been divided into two separated parts which did not communicate with each other exteriorly. These parts are the Occidental or Roman Church and the dissident Oriental Church, or the different autocephalic churches of Byzantine Rite. Therefore, according to these theologians, the visible unity has been destroyed. Only invisible unity remains. At the present day then, the universal Church would be dipartite. Some contemporary Greco-Russian theologians teach a third breaking of the universal Church, thus making it tripartite, if not multipartite. This conception becomes more common in the autocephalic Church, as is evident in the reports made at the first Congress of Orthodox Theology held at Athens, November 29 to December 6, 1926. Five professors, of whom two were Greek, one Bulgarian, one Serbian, and one Rumanian, read each a dissertation on the ecumenical council concerning its possibility and its conditions. The five were unanimous in declaring that the Orthodox Church by itself was incapable of forming an ecumenical council because this church is not a universal church, but only one of its parts—the best part, of course. This statement is contrary to the classic thesis of the dissident theological manuals which teach that the Greco-Russian Church is the only true Church, and the only one to possess the four notes. It is, however, a fact that the contemporary dissident theologians depart more and more from the theses of the old manuals.

2. *The early Church had a Primate, or sole visible head, established by Jesus Christ Himself, whose authority was recognized by the totality of the local churches. The Primate was the Apostle Peter, and after him, the Bishop of Rome.*

Here an exposition is made of the classical demonstration of the Primacy of Divine Right of St. Peter and his successor, the Bishop of Rome. It contains the whole classical *via primatus*. (pp. 10-84) The author utilizes the latest studies published on the Roman Primacy of the first three centuries. He completes a demonstration through the ninth century. He draws his testimony especially from the acts of the ecumenical councils and from the writings of the Greek Fathers. From these testimonies it becomes clearly evident that the ancient Byzantine Church, still and especially in the century of Photius, recognized the Bishop of Rome's primacy of authority over the universal Church as the successor of the Apostle Peter. It is impossible for the dissidents to escape this conclusion without actually denying the evidence itself. At the end of this section the author answers the principal exegetical

historical and speculative objections which the Greco-Russians usually raise against the Roman Primacy.

3. *In case of doctrinal conflict or of new heresy, the early Church had an infallible magisterium to terminate controversies in a definitive manner. The organs of this magisterium were either the Bishop of Rome alone, or the ecumenical council presided over or approved by him.*

This point is no less important than the preceding. The author points out a difference between the two sovereign doctrinal authorities recognized by the early Church. The Pope can and often did act independently of the ecumenical council to close a debate, or to terminate a controversy. On the other hand, the ecumenical council requires the presence of the Pope or of his representation through legates, and his approbation to merit the title of ecumenical and thus be considered as infallible authority. *No ecumenical council without the Pope: such is the axiom unanimously recognized and proclaimed in the early Church.*

4. *The early Church had a clearly marked character of universality. According to the commandment of Jesus Christ, she preached the Gospel to all nations, without distinction of races and tongues. She was catholic by her missionary activity and by her geographic expansion which was ceaselessly increasing.*

"Go, teach all nations," Jesus Christ said to his disciples. This is a rigorous precept which the true Church cannot escape. Where this apostolic preoccupation does not exist, one may say the Spirit of God does not inhabit. Doubtless, the missionary spirit and activity is not *in itself* the distinctive mark of the true Church, *but it is a necessary part of that which should be found in the true Church.* If its presence alone does not suffice to denote the authentic work of Christ, its absence in a religious society proves that it is not to be identified with the Church which was founded by Jesus Christ.

5. *The early Church was a perfect religious society, supernational, governing herself, and sufficient to herself, independent of the secular power and combatting its encroachments.*

The author proves this proposition by historical events and by the doctrine of the Greek and Latin Fathers. It is a fact that from the time of Constantine the Church was obliged to struggle greatly against imperial caesaropapism. She always maintained the distinction between the two powers and never permitted herself to be absorbed by the State.

6. *The early Church faithfully guarded Jesus Christ's precept on the indissolubility of marriage and His condemnation of divorce.* This point is usually left in the shadow by Catholic apologists. Nevertheless, it is very important because it constitutes the basis of family and social moral.[4]

---

4) *Unitas*, in its first number, March, 1946, pp. 43-61, printed the author's treatment of this topic for the first time.

7. *The early Church, while remaining immutable in its essence, underwent the law of development and progress.*

During the first nine centuries, the Church followed the law of development in all the domains of her activity. Although dogmatic development alone is usually spoken of in this respect, there were different kinds. There was likewise progress in hierarchical organization, in sacred rites and forms of worship, in discipline and the means of sanctification, and in geographical expansion through the apostolate.

After developing the Major of his argument in this manner, the author passes to the demonstration of the Minor. He shows without difficulty that none of the present Christian groups separated from Catholicism possesses integrally the essential elements enumerated above. In the first place, all the separated Churches lack at least two of the distinctive notes pointed out in the early Church. These are the second and the sixth. None obeys Peter and his successor, the Bishop of Rome. All at a certain moment in history have broken away from him. The Nestorians and Monophysites broke away in the fifth century, the Byzantines in the eleventh century, and the Protestants in the sixteenth century. All practice and authorize divorce for the various causes enumerated by the author, and these are not at all limited to the case of adultery as is commonly believed. The Greco-Russian Church, for example, and this since the Byzantine period, admits at least twenty reasons for divorce properly so-called.

All these churches have lost the power of teaching infallibly and of terminating controversies definitively. Dogmatic development was arrested among them the day they separated themselves from Rome.

There is no more ecumenical council, and no new definitions to bar the way to heresy, but there are perpetual variations on the points which were not defined by the early councils. Consequently, Fr. Jugie applies this telling proof against the principal among all the separated Churches, the Greco-Russian Church. There is no need of this proof in regard to the Protestant confessions. The Anglicans who most closely approach the character of a church are undermined by doctrinal dissensions which are commonly known.

Most of these churches have lost their independence and are strictly subjected to the State. They manifest a very pronounced national or racial character. One finds among them little or no missionary zeal to preach the Gospel to the infidels, with the exception of the Anglicans and certain other Protestant sects where it appears only in the nineteenth century.

After this demonstration, the author rightfully concludes, "Either the Church which Jesus Christ has founded has disappeared from the earth, or this Church is identified with the Roman Church. If the first alternative is inacceptable to those who believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ and in the inspiration of the Sacred Scripture, the second must in all necessity be accepted. It is impossible to escape it."

This conclusion is sufficient in itself to answer the question *where is integral Christianity found?* It permits us also to affirm *a priori* that the Roman Catholic Church possesses without exception all the essential elements found in the ancient Church. However, the author is not satisfied with this negative proof. In a special chapter (Chap. III) he demonstrates that the Catholic Church possesses all these elements in fact. The dissidents are at fault when they raise a number of objections against this conclusion. These objections are discussed in Chapter IV. Among the most outstanding of these accusations are: exaggerated centralization, arrogant autocracy and lack of fraternal spirit of collaboration, namely what the Russins call *sobornost* (a collegial tendency, or spirit of the council); ecumenical councils rendered useless and which are practically suppressed by the dogma of the Roman Pontiff's infallibility as defined by the Vatican Council; Catholicism made obscure and illusory by Latinism and Italianism; flagrant abuses caused by the secular sovereignty of the Popes during the long period of their pretensions of being temporal as well as spiritual powers (papocaesarism); unrestrained spirit of innovation in all matters—abolition of ancient Christianity's most venerable customs, especially in regard to the Sacraments; and almost total suppression of the metropolitans' rights. A brief and objective response is made to all these difficulties. The real abuses are not denied, but it is shown that they were accidental and transitory.

By way of conclusion, the author follows the thought of Newman, declaring that if the Fathers of the Church came back to the earth, they would recognize the Church of their time not in one or the other community separated from Rome, but in the Roman Catholic Church alone, even though they might be astonished by certain new aspects which they could not have foreseen.

Such is the general development of this new method of Catholic demonstration. Obviously, it intends not so much to prove directly that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church as it does to establish that all Churches separated from Rome are false and do not fully respond either to the plan Jesus Christ had in founding His Church or to the realization of this plan in the early Church. One must recognize with the author that this demonstration is shorter, clearer, and more apt to make an impression upon the Oriental dissidents than is the classical method by the four notes. However, could one not object to Fr. Jugie that he was somewhat arbitrary in choosing the seven points indicated in the Major of his argument? Would the dissidents be able to respond with a list of defects in the Roman Church as compared to the Church of the first nine centuries?

Doubtless he would answer that one can only wait for a list, estimate the force of such an offensive, and deal with it accordingly. The science of Apologetics does not move in the domain of the absolute, but in that of the

concrete and the relative. It is hardly feasible to erect an *ad omnia* system of Apologetics. Each particular case and each category of adversaries must be examined, and a consequent defense provided. The affirmation that the Catholic Church alone possesses the four properties stated in the Creed is the outcome of an intention to construct an absolute apologetic argument, but this insistence upon absolute Apologetics has led its protagonists to an impasse, and obliged them to revise their definitions several times.

One could as well reproach Fr. Jugie, as has already been done, for the boldly frank manner and the lack of rhetorical precaution which characterizes the whole of his exposition. Did he not fail in tact if he would gain the ear of the dissidents? It would seem that such a reproach is merited. As a matter of fact, the author has evidently not intended to do a directly unionistic work. He wished, above all, to do a didactic and apologetic work by proposing a method of Catholic demonstration which is a new one from various points of view. His work remains, notwithstanding, of such a nature that it should inspire the dissidents with salutary reflections upon the state of their respective churches, and guide them along the way which leads to the Roman Church. It might well focus their reflections upon that Church of which Irenaeus spoke in the second century when he said: "Because of her superior authority, every other church must necessarily be in accord with that church."

E. Goudal

Comments and Documents

THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF'S THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT*

We do not intend in these few lines to make an exposition or even a summary of the theological thought which the reigning Pontiff has expressed in ten years of his fruitful pontificate and in as many volumes. We have merely selected some points which have impressed us most, and which seem most characteristic.

The doctrine of the Church, so important in this present hour, has been frequently and profoundly explained by the Holy Father. The Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* (June 29, 1943) teaches how the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ—one, undivided, visible, organized under a hierarchy, and vivified by grace through the Sacraments. Christ is its omnipotent Head, who governs it through the Roman Pontiff, visible head of the universal Church, and through the bishops who rule the single Churches under the authority of the Pope. The grand concept he holds of the Supreme Magisterium is manifest in his writings as in his acts. The Pope inherits the powers conceded to St. Peter from the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. In the very first year of his pontificate, he said in one of his discourses to married couples, "whatever the name, the face, or the human origin of each Pope, it is always Peter who lives in him; it is Peter who directs and governs; it is above all Peter who teaches and spreads over the world the light of the truth which makes free." (*Discorsi,* vol. I, p. 318). The Holy Ghost, Spirit of Jesus, infuses into the Church united with its visible head those supernatural gifts which constitute the dignity of the Christian and which are the guarantee of eternal happiness.

Those who profess dissident or erroneous confessions do not belong to this Church unless it be *in voto*. In this regard, Pius XII maintains all the sacred intransigence of the truth, but at the same time he takes advantage of every occasion to demonstrate his desire for the return of our dissident brothers to the Mother Church. He said to the Catholics of the Greek Melchite rite: "The hour has come in which the sons of the House should double their zeal to show their brothers the home they seek, and to help them pass over the threshold." (*Discorsi,* vol. I, p. 62). In a recent message to the German Catholics gathered at Mainz he said, "We know how urgent is the aspiration for unity of faith among many of your people, both Catholic and non-Catholic. And who could feel this desire more keenly than the Vicar of Christ himself?" (*Osservatore Romano,* Nov. 9, 1948). One reads equally moving appeals in the Encyclical *Orientalis Ecclesiae* (April 9, 1944) for the fifteenth centenary of the death of St. Cyril of Alexandria, in the Encyclical *Orientales omnes* (Dec. 23, 1945) for the 350th anniversary of the Ruthenians' return to union with the Apostolic See, and elsewhere.

*First published in *Bollettino Ufficiale, Anno Santo MCML,* Rome, 1949.

Theologians will find much in the Acts of Pius XII which bears upon the doctrine of the Most Holy Virgin. In the epilogue of the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* cited above, these very significative words are found on the Co-Redemptrix: "It was she, free of personal and hereditary sin, always most closely united with her Son, who offered Him, together with the holocaust of her maternal rights and her maternal love, to the Eternal Father on Golgotha for all the children of Adam who had been stained by his wretched sin."

Perhaps the hour is near in which Pius XII will proclaim with his infallible word a privilege of Our Lady which has already been dear to the hearts of Christians for many centuries—that of the Assumption. The Holy Father has requested the opinion of all the Cardinals and bishops of the world on this definition. In one of his discourses, he cited and approved the words of Suarez for whom "this privilege . . . refers glory to God and to Jesus Christ Our Lord, and is most eminently suitable to the most high dignity, innocence, purity and charity of the Virgin" (Radio message to the last National Eucharistic Congress of Cuba, Feb. 24, 1947. *Discorsi,* vol. VIII. The text is in Spanish). On another occasion, after some consideration of the faithful awaiting the solemn definition and seeming to say "*Et nunc, Petre, doce nos,*" the Holy Father invokes the Immaculate Queen "who reigns gloriously in Heaven in body and in soul" (Radio message to the International Congress of Marian Congregations at Barcelona, Dec. 7, 1947. *Discorsi,* vol. IX, p. 377).

We point out as well the important Encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu* (Dec. 30, 1943), in which he recommends recourse to all the means which the modern sciences of history and philology have developed for the interpretation of Sacred scripture. He has likewise put at the disposition of all a new Latin translation of the Psalms which has been made accurately from the original text.

Much could be said on the Pastoral Theology of the Holy Father. He imparts the dogmatic and moral theology of the family to the newly married couples whom he receives regularly, as he reminds both governments and peoples of the true social doctrine. The eucharistic congresses offer him the occasion to enrich the minds of the faithful with the treasures of faith and charity which the Holy Eucharist contains. (He has declared with perfect precision what is necessary and what is not necessary in the conferring of the highest Orders.) The beatifications and canonizations are illuminated with many discourses, full of wisdom. In these he exalts the divine power of grace in the work of salvation, while he also insistently brings to mind the necessity of human cooperation.

May these brief references arouse the desire of many, both priests and simple faithful, and especially the theologians, to read and re-read the volumes

which contain so great a light of doctrine and piety. The arms of the reigning Pontiff show a dove carrying an olive branch. It could be thought of as representing the Holy Ghost Who, as He spoke in days gone by to St. Gregory the Great, speaks words of wisdom again today to the Supreme Pastor.

Charles Boyer, S.J.

* * * *

SEE OF PETER, SEAT OF UNITY

PASTORAL LETTER OF HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL GREGORY PETER XV AGAGIANIAN, ARMENIAN CATHOLIC PATRIARCH OF CILICIA

Looking forward with saintly appreciation to the Holy Year which will open in the Eternal City on the next vigil of Christ's Nativity, His Eminence Cardinal Gregory Peter XV Agagianian has been moved to compose a Pastoral Letter in praise of the See of Peter. It jubilantly overflows and sparkles with that doctrine which establishes Peter's successor as the Vicar of Christ and the "source and root of Christian unity." We offer the body of this text to UNITAS readers. One section is published in this issue. The remainder will follow in subsequent issues.

After commemorating the golden jubilee of the Holy Father's Priesthood and announcing the joyous news of the Holy Year when pilgrims will come from his Near East and from the four corners of the globe to the Eternal City "where the foundation of the Holy Church was laid," he continues:

The approach of these joyous circumstances imposes upon Us the agreeable obligation, and offers Us the desired occasion of publishing this Pastoral Letter. Through it We intend to revivify in all hearts faith and love toward the divinely founded Apostolic Roman See, which is the source and root of Christian unity.

The Primacy of the Sovereign Pontiff—behold, Venerable Brothers and Dear Sons, a truth about which one may and should repeat the words of Simeon, the holy ancient, for Jesus Himself: "He will be a sign of contradiction" (Luke 2,34). And what contradiction! Greater than ever in our days, when still once again ignorance, prejudices, falsifications, calumnies, and a formidable tyranny imposed by the atheistic states combat the Holy See in a war without mercy with the intention of destroying it.

Notwithstanding, in the light of two thousand years' wonderful testimony the realization of Jesus' plan is clear and simple, not only for us who, through a free gift of God, enjoy the grace and the clear understanding of the Catholic Faith, but also for all those who approach the problem without prejudice—with humility and love of truth. To be sure, each year tens of

1) Armenian Hymnarium.

thousands of persons, among the most civilized peoples, the most learned and the most free, return to the Catholic Church and bow before the truth. They find at one time the peace of their spirit and of their heart in the light they had long and ardently desired, and true liberty from all error and all false science. They feel that they are "no longer strangers and foreigners, but . . . citizens with the saints and members of God's household: . . . built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets with Christ Jesus Himself as the chief corner stone." (Eph. 2,19-20)

But who is the Sovereign Pontiff according to Catholic faith and doctrine?

Let us for a moment visit in spirit the Basilica of St. Peter in the Eternal City. It is a feast day. The largest church of Christendom with its dome raised toward the heavens, with its famous statues and pictures, is flooded with light. Beneath its vaults tens of thousands of faithful, of every nation and tongue, are impatiently waiting in prayer for the coming of the Sovereign Pontiff. The silver trumpets sound the traditional hymn. Here comes the papal cortege: many representatives of the regular and secular clergy, the Abbotts General and the Procurators of religious orders pass; the Bishops follow, then the Cardinals, and at last the Holy Father appears, surrounded by his ecclesiastical and civil court. At the sight of the Common Father, the sons are powerless to withhold a cry of enthusiasm which springs spontaneously from their hearts. The silver trumpets are hushed, but the famous and powerful Sistine Choir raise their voices in this expression and profession of their indomitable faith: "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church." The feeling of the Church's stability and perpetuity takes possession of the whole attendance, and in the person of the Sovereign Pontiff, they acclaim Peter, forever immortal in his successors. . . .

We now open the Holy Gospel. We will find there the creative word which will reveal to us the part which Christ, God, Founder of the Church, assigned to Peter in that divine institution.

The study of the divinely inspired Books makes it plain that Our Lord Jesus Christ, come to the world "that he might gather into one the children of God who were scattered abroad" (John 11,52) founded a Church—that divine institution for the gathering together of all humanity—and endowed and specified it with various admirable prerogatives and qualities.

If the Church which Christ founded is on the one hand interior and spiritual insomuch as it obtains the remission of sins, supernatural life in Christ and the Holy Ghost, and the plenitude of graces and heavenly gifts, she is also, and at the same time, exterior and visible insomuch as she is composed of men.

She is equally universal and perpetual according to the messages of Christ: "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached *in the whole world,* for a witness *to all nations*" (Matt. 24,14), "they will come from the east

and from the west, from the north and from the south, and will feast in the kingdom of God" (Luke 13,29). "Go, therefore, teach ye all nations . . . and behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world" (Matt. 28,19-20).

She is one and unique for all humanity and endowed with a very intimate interior unity.

In fact, Christ speaks of one sole church, which He calls His own, and refers to it in the singular: "I will build My church" (Matt. 16,18); He has before His divine eyes the moving and eloquent perspective of "one sole flock and one sole pastor," and for all time. And in the sublime prayer which He uttered during those effusions of extreme love, "the night when He was betrayed," He implores time after time and most ardently His heavenly Father for His apostles, and for all those who will believe in their preaching. He beseeches of the Father a unity at once both intimate and visible, which will bear the resemblance of the ineffable Union existing between the Father and the Son, and which will be a proof of His divine mission, and a specific note of His Church. It will be a union whose bond is neither political, national, racial nor deriving from any other element from here below; but a singular union, flowing from the principles laid down by Jesus and proper to His Church (John 17,11-23).

Moreover, the Church which Christ founded is hierarchical. The simple members differ from certain others to whom Jesus confides the care and the charge of governing the multitude of the faithful.

In truth, at the beginning of his public life, Christ attaches to Himself a group of disciples chosen from the crowd. He reveals the secrets of the Kingdom of Heaven to them in a particular fashion (Matt. 13,11). He even chooses twelve from among them "whom he also named apostles." (Luke 6,13).

His holy will is that the mission and work of the apostles be the continuation of His own mission and work (John 17,18). Shortly before His ascension into Heaven, He tells them "All power in heaven and on earth has been given to me" (Matt. 28,18); "*As the Father has sent Me, I also send you*" (John 20,21), "Go, therefore, teach ye all nations" (Matt. 28,19). Their jurisdiction extends to consciences: "whatever you bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven" (Matt. 18,18). Finally the salvation of souls depends upon the indispensable faith and obedience accorded to their mission: "He who believes and is baptized shall be saved, but he who does not believe shall be condemned." (Mark 16,16)

The existence of the apostolic college through Christ's will is proof in itself of the hierarchical character and structure of the Church.

But the holy Gospel testifies patently that Christ made a choice even among the twelve Apostles, and treated the apostle Peter in a particular way.

He made solemn promises especially to him, and in the singular. He addressed very clear and significative words to him, creating him *head* of the apostolic group, *foundation* of the Church, *invincible teacher* of the holy faith, *universal shepherd* and *head* of his flock.

Let us see these testimonies:

At the first meeting with Simon, son of Jona, "Jesus, looking upon him"—holding him by a mild, noble and penetrating look—said to him: "Thou art Simon, the son of Jona. Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter" (John 1,42). No other apostle is dealt with nor addressed in this mysterious fashion. Moreover, in Scriptural language, a name imposed by God upon someone is a sign of a special divine intention and design in regard to that same person. Jesus is often signified in Sacred Scripture by the name "rock" (imposed upon Simon): "Cornerstone" (Ps. 116), "and the rock was Christ" (I Cor. 10,4). This is the reason that a Father of the Armenian Church, Chenorhali (The Graceful), writes in the twelfth century: "He (the Christ) imparts to him His invincible name."

Jesus Himself explains the mysterious design and intention which this change of name denotes. He explains in this wise:

"Now Jesus, having come into the district of Caesarea Philippi, began to ask His disciples, saying, 'Who do men say the Son of Man is?' But they said, 'Some say, John the Baptist; and others, Elias, and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets.' He said to them, 'But who do you say that I am?' Simon Peter answered and said, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' Then Jesus answered and said, 'Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, for flesh and blood has not revealed this to thee, but My Father in heaven. And I say to thee, thou are Peter, and upon this rock I shall build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' (Matt. 16,13-19).

Christ compares His Church to a building and says that Peter will be its foundation. But just as the foundation of a building is the cause of its unity, coherence, solidity and duration, so will Peter, through Christ's will, be the cause of the unity, coherence, solidity and duration of the Church.

But, since it is true that the Church is a moral building, a universal society, *being its foundation* signifies having its jurisdiction and the entire and supreme direction, because it is the supreme authority which assures society of its unity, coherence, solidity and duration. We read, indeed, in the Book of Proverbs, "Where there is no governor, the people shall fall" (Prov. 11,14).

Christ, continuing His words, and still addressing them to Peter in the singular, adds: "And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and what ever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

Just as above Jesus had compared His Church to a building, so here He

compares it to a kingdom, and He says that He will entrust its keys to Peter.

No one is ignorant of the sense and the interpretation of this metaphore. When a king enters a city, the keys are presented to him to signify his absolute power over it. The inspired Books use this expression elsewhere to designate absolute and supreme power. In the Apocalypse, Christ appears saying: "I have the keys of death and of hell" (Apoc. 1,8), that is, I have absolute power over death and hell.

Thus, through the metaphor of the keys, Jesus once again promises to Peter supreme power over the Church which He calls "Kingdom of Heaven" for the reason that although its activities unfold upon this earth, it conducts men to heaven.

By virtue of this supreme power accorded under the symbol of the keys, what Peter will bind upon this earth will also be bound in Heaven, and what he will loose upon this earth will also be loosed in Heaven. It is therefore an absolute authority which is not limited excepting by God and by the purposes of the Church. It comprises the faculties of teaching the truth, of instituting or abrogating ecclesiastical laws, of judging, punishing or forgiving, of remitting sins and punishment for sins: in a word, it is the power by divine investiture of governing the whole Church.

(To be continued)

* * * *

PROTESTANTS AT WORK ON THE CONCEPT *CHURCH*

On March 14th Professor Karl Barth, in an address to an assembly of 400 theologians at Zurich-Wipkingen in Switzerland, discussed the task which faces the World Council. He said that the essential problem is that of church unity, and that this is the "question of the faith, the confession, and the nature of the Church." Recent activities among various groups of Protestants show them already so energetically at work upon the concept of *Church* that Professor Barth's pronouncement appears rather to voice a common preoccupation.

Russian Protestants Publish Their Doctrine

The Union of Evangelical Christians in the U.S.S.R.[1] is at the present time working out a constitution. The "doctrine of the Church" is given in detail in Volume 4 of the Union's periodical *Bratsky Vestnik*. In it we find these passages:

"What is the universal (invisible) Church? The fellowship of redeemed souls, penitent, converted and born anew, from all ages, nations and Churches, and of the Churches of the Christian home (family), on earth as in heaven, i.e., 'the Church that knows the manifold wisdom of God' (Eph. 3-10). It is the 'Kingdom of God,' where 'God reigns in Christ.'

1) Cf. *Union of Baptists and Evangelicals.*

"The visible Church, with its limitations, is composed of many local churches of souls united by the same Christian creed and spiritual rebirth. . . . Communities of the visible Church may vary in structure and in their interpretation of certain passages of Scripture. In their 'mutual intercession,' however, and in their parallel work, they are none the less Christ's, as long as they hold fast to 'freedom as Christ preached it,'" (EPS)

The description of the universal or invisible church contains individual assertions which are clearly Christian. Still more are needed, however, to describe the Church which Christ left with the Apostles for us. It lacks, for instance, any requirement on the part of Christians still laboring on the earth of affirming loyal belief in every truth which came forth from the divine Teacher. May they in their devotion to Him and in their will to humility reconsider the advantage of receiving instruction from a teacher who knows both Heaven and the mind of the Father, and who taught as a man by word of mouth to men. His phrases were adapted to the speech and thought pattern peculiar to His Palestinian hearers, but nevertheless conveyed each its proper, unequivocal meaning. His wisdom is indeed "manifold," but is it any less *one* for that reason? Since the wisdom of the one God is infinite, His truth is necessarily many-faceted in the eyes of mortals, but still remains immutably and objectively one in reality. Christ, God, reigns indeed as a King in His Kingdom, but, as He explained before the skeptic Pilate, He is King of those who obey truth: "Everyone who is of the truth hears My voice." (John 18-37) Can an obedient subject to this King of truth be satisfied with what may be partial truth, or even a subjectivistic variation of it? The directions which Christ gave to the Apostles in Matthew 16,15 when he sent them out to teach leaves little room for such a risk and does not seem to confirm this kind of freedom.

The notion of a visible Church presupposes the existence of many ideas upon Christ's doctrine. It is evident that as the various groups of Christian confession exist in actuality, some of these lack doctrines which others embrace, and some of them are contradictory. If Christ as King demands submission to His truth exclusively, and if its acceptance is necessary, we would encourage our separated brothers to proceed further in the way of humble good will and examine the problem of the necessity of a divinely protected authority to safeguard the legacy of Christ's doctrine among fallible mortals. Let them scrutinize well those texts of Scripture which indicate that Jesus Christ actually did confer such authority upon Peter to last in perpetuity.

Results of Unity Conversations in England

The will to unity between Anglicans and Free Evangelicals in England has brought about concentrated labor upon the concept of Church along with that of the Ministry which is necessarily involved in it. Conversations between representatives appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and those ap-

pointed by the Free Evangelical groups began at High Leigh in 1947 and were resumed in December last. The members of this conference have affirmed their conviction that the preferable method of approaching unity in England is that suggested by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his Cambridge sermon of 1946. He advocated an approach not by organic union, but first by the recovery of a common ministry acceptable to all the confessions. An Interim Report summarizing the Conversations, which has now been published, furnishes material of no small import for consideration.

The representatives declare their satisfaction in what they find to be complete agreement upon many fundamental doctrinal points. As for the doctrine of the Church and the Ministry, their opinion is that substantial agreement exists.

They affirm the visible unity of a Church which is organized upon the basis of a divine authority. "The Church is not a voluntary association of individual believers. . . . It rests on the creative will of God." It continues: "The visible unity of the Church is the divine will for it." When the report proceeds to an explanation of this visible unity, however, it takes on something of an illusive, if not paradoxical character. "Visible unity does not imply uniformity, but implies at least that each part of the Church is able to recognize every other part as professing a true faith and administering the sacraments and discipline of Christ by means of its Ministry, in such a way that there are no barriers of principle to prevent cooperation in evangelization and free mutual participation in worship and sacraments.

"The Ministry, being the gift of God to the Church, and existing in and for the Church, is integral to the continuation of the mission of Christ to the world. . . .

"The unity and continuity of the faith should be preserved; that is, the order of the Church should be such as to symbolize, safeguard, and mediate the apostolic message and mission.

"An essential element in continuity is the maintenance of the apostolic faith, worship and witness as set out in the New Testament.

"Is is recognized that the intention of existing Ministries, both episcopal and non-episcopal, is to preserve the unity, continuity and universality of the Church." (EPS)

One could be tempted to find reasons for optimism in these declarations of a God-given Ministry to preserve the unity, continuity and universality of the Church. It would seem that they had gained firm ground and a sure footing from which to face squarely and grapple with the patent divergencies and oscillations of doctrinal faith among English non-Catholics throughout the period begun in the sixteenth century. One could see here a firm step ahead toward an ultimate return to one objective, immutable doctrine. Such would be the case if the agreement were sound. Unfortunately it appears to

be vitiated by an inherent contradiction. If an episcopally ordained Ministry is not of divine institution, and not an integral part of apostolic teaching, then the Anglicans should relinquish further pretensions to it. If it is a part of divine doctrine, how can "each part of the Church . . . recognize every other parts as professing a true faith and administering the sacraments and discipline of Christ by means of its Ministry?"

It is to be noted that the Archbishop of Canterbury's representatives have abandoned all intention of continuing their forefathers' doctrine of the Real Presence—otherwise they would be considering as negligible the difference between a piece of bread and the Saviour's Flesh and Blood, which is wholly unthinkable.

The will to a comprehensive sort of unity in a divinely authorized Church molded to the desires of all might console the spirits of those who are harassed by the fruits of dissension—it could be pleasant as a sweet dream is pleasant, and brings a smile to the lips of the sleeper. Optimism is pleasant, indeed, but only warranted when it is founded upon reality. It is hard to be optimistic here. The writer hopes that the contradictions of the Interim Report are obvious to him because of some obstinate blindness or gross misinterpretation, and that the authors of the Conversations have not passed their time in spinning another Wonderland where there is no night because the peoples of both hemispheres have gallantly agreed to call it day.

* * * *

A FEDERATION IS NOT A CHURCH

The concept of Church came to the fore at a convention of the EKD (German Evangelical Church) at Eisenach. The problem confronted them of maintaining intact both the character of *federation* and that of *church*. The difficulty was resolved with an agreement upon a "Eucharist Community" (*Abendmahlsgemeinschaft*) in which doctrinal differences would be respected. This phrase was criticized by the provisional direction of the VELKS (United Evangelical Churches of Germany). It objected in the *Neue Zeitung* of Munich that the EKD is not a Church, and should not attempt to add the predicate of Church to its character of federation, it adds that the purpose of the EKD does not include the forming of a "Eucharist Community." Dr. Brunotte, ecclesiastical counselor of the VELKS, also stated in an interview "the EKD is not a Church, but a federation of churches, totally distinct from the confessional point of view, of which the most numerous group is formed by Lutherans." (News Bulletin, Geneva and EPS)

* * * *

A LUTHERAN RESOLUTION

The Council of Moderators of the Reformed Federation of Germany while gathered at Detmold in early February passed a resolution on "the

Confessional Problem Today" which has more to say upon the concept of Church, especially in respect to what it is not. The resolution states that the Church is not to be built up on a foundation of inherited confession. It is not based on historical resolutions taken by men, of however tremendous a value. The confession demonstrates, with the words of the Fathers, how the Scriptures are to be understood; how far the confession is really to be accepted at the present day depends on how far it accords with the Scriptures. Only the Scriptures can occasion a change in the confessional position of the Church. (EPS)

A Catholic feels immediately the want of a further clarification; namely, how are individual Protestants or groups of them at the present day to know with certainty when their profession accords precisely with the Scriptures?

* * * *

LUTHERAN TRADITION

With regard to the Lutheran confession and the concept of Church, Pastor Max Thurian points out that it would be contrary to the intention of Luther for them to consider themselves as a distinct Church. He writes (*Catholicité,* July, 1947, p. 21): "Everyone knows that Luther at the beginning of his effort, never had the idea of founding a Church which would stand as a rival to the Roman Church. He thought that his reform was to be accomplished in the interior, and it was only after great struggles and persevering efforts of faithfulness and of loyalty toward the Pope that he accepted the rupture. But even then he hoped the whole Church would be drawn after him, and all its impurity swept clean. . . .

"The error of the reformed Church was often the will to be the only true Church and the only possible one, consciously or unconsciously. . . . It does not exist by itself, but is a prophetic image willed by God for the Reform of his unfaithful Church. When the reformed Church loses the sense of this prophetic vocation, when it becomes catholic in its own way, the Reform is no longer accomplished. It is nothing more than a *bad copy of the Church* which it ought to invite to a reform, instead of being a *faithful image of the Body of Christ for the Church.* It takes to proselytizing instead of awakening salutary and reformatory concern through the preaching of the Gospel; it makes *tabula rasa* of all tradition in giving itself a separate organization and liturgy. . . . The reformed Church fulfills its ministry when it becomes the image of a reformed prophetic catholicism, called to disappear when the reform is accomplished."

A divinely authorized mission existing in opposition to the authority divinely committed to the Vicar of Christ, which objectively Pastor Thurian's argument presupposes, is evidently an untenable premise. Yet however faulty such a basic *raison d'être* of Lutheranism may be, it would seem of itself to

preclude an attempt of Lutherans to organize as a Church understood in the sense of a distinct body, complete in itself, to which God wishes all his faithful to adhere, and which is destined to prevail until the end of time. On the contrary its own existence seems to testify that some such body does exist, and upon which it, in a sense, depends. S. B.

* * * *

A SHEEP, THE SHEPHERD AND THE ONE FOLD

Mother Elizabeth Hesselblad was once termed by Cardinal Merry del Val "the most remarkable woman in Rome." She is the Mother General of the Brigittine Order who has acquired St. Bridget's ancient home at Rome for her Brigittine nuns, and has succeeded in penetrating the last stronghold of the Reform to restore St. Bridget's order in the house of is origin at Vadstena in Sweden.

Her conversion to the Catholic Faith is the story of an iron-bound determination to serve God alone. (A detailed account of it is to be carried in the June issue of *The Lamp*.[1])

As a child of six attending a Lutheran Sunday school she become troubled because her little girl friends went different ways on Sunday to worship God. Some went to the Lutheran Church with her, but others went to a Baptist Church, others to the Methodist, and some went to the mission halls. She had read in her Bible that there should be one Shepherd, one Flock and one Fold. Where could this one true Fold be? She studied over the problem and prayed. Maria, as she was then called, walked sometimes alone in the forest to meditate upon her sad problem. There she found companionship in a wonderful Presence which she sensed among the trees. She confided her anxiety to Him and trusted in Him to lead her to the one Fold of His desire.

As a very young lady she journeyed to America where she lived a busy life in the metropolis of New York. After some years of intense study and labor she rose to be directress of a large Hospital. However in her tireless service to the sick and poor it was God Whom she was serving, and only Him Whom she followed and obeyed.

She studied the various religious sects unremittingly in a quest for a clearer vision of the Presence Who still accompanied her, and for the one Fold which she had set for her goal.

Maria Hesselblad was bold in her search for the Pearl of Great Price. Having come upon books of Catholic doctrine she gave no quarter to the prejudices of her early education, but proceeded to learn what the Catholic Church had to teach. She investigated the sublime doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist, and began to frequent the tabernacles of Catholic Churches. They drew her with an almost sensible attraction. Kneeling before the Blessed Sacrament she was alone with her God and at peace. This solitary adoration

1) Peekskill, N. Y., U. S. A., pp. 182-186.

suited her since she had devoutly built up the habit of living like a hermit in the clamorous bustle of her daily life. Her soul lived alone with that divine Presence, her one and exclusive love.

She knew Catholic doctrine and approved it. She admired the harmonious order of the Church's hierarchy where authority passed from the Divine Head through His Vicar and was administered by a circle of Bishops to the Priests, and throngs of the faithful. One impediment remained standing between her and her entrance to the True Fold, and this was the external activity of the Church. The Catholic Church, in fact, has a social character. It embraces the whole gamut of community life. Its discipline, its liturgy, and its parish life is wrapped up in a thousand external manifestations. Should she open the door of her soul to this Catholic society and permit all these unaccustomed practices to flow in upon her solitude? Could she in conscience permit any intrusion upon her divine Host? She concluded that this would be an act of unfaithfulness and resolved to persist in her trust that He would guide her. She said within herself, "I shall find my Father's house."

She stood one day with two Catholic friends on the steps of St. Gudule at Brussels awaiting the Procession of Corpus Christi. She was hemmed in by the crowds which filled the steps and banked up against the imposing façade. Artillery officers in gala uniforms passed by on horseback. A band played. The procession filed down the steps in a confusion of many colored robes and glittering vestments. Her whole being cried out against prayer in such a throng. She could certainly not bring herself to kneel when the Blessed Sacrament passed, and at the same time she could certainly not offend the pious sentiments of her dear friends. Quietly passing through the spectators to the top of the steps, she hid herself behind one of the great doors. She was standing behind the refuge of the Church door when the golden monstrance approached and passed by bearing the Sacramental Body of her Divine Lord. At that moment she heard the words, "I am He Whom thou seekest." Something seemed to push her gently to her knees while an exquisite sense of peace overwhelmed her heart. Then she returned to her friends, her face aglow, and reported that she had been kneeling behind the door and saying, "I believe." This was the moment in which Mother Elizabeth Hesselblad was enabled to accept the whole Christ, and after which she knew no further impediment between her and entrance to the One True Fold which she had set out to find as a perplexed little girl in Sweden.

S. B.

* * * *

*THE CRUSADE AGAINST THE OCCIDENT**

If one considers recent events, he is obliged to acknowledge that with the total support of the Orthodox clergy, a triple offensive has been planned

*This account of Soviet religious policy is reprinted from La Monde, *March* 10, 1949.

in Oriental Europe against the three "occidental" religious cults. In Rumania the Greek Catholic Church has been obliged to sever obedience to Rome and adhere to the dissident Oriental Church. This mass "conversion" strongly recalls that of the Saxons by Charlemagne. In Hungary the interest in decapitating the Catholic Church had as consequence the Mindszenty process. In Bulgaria the public powers have seethed against the Protestant sects. This disturbing coincidence confirms all the information coming from central Europe.

The intention is not to destroy the religious spirit of the masses. The Communist party does not speak any longer of the "opium of the people." Quite on the contrary, the popular democracies must rely upon tried spiritual and moral values. The best means is to have the Churches devoted to the new order. One among them is predestined: the Oriental dissident Church. Others by their very structure are capable of maintaining the official policy; for example, the Reformed Czechoslovak Church whose national Hussite tradition, independent of the occidentals, forms a powerful lever.

Support the Oriental dissidents, rally the Greek Catholic Churches around it, favor the Protestant sects of national tendency, such is the essential of the program whose application we see today.

The irreducibles, and particularly the Roman Catholics, "vassals of the Vatican," must be combatted ceaselessly, but with method. Above all, martyrs must not be made. The only solution is to compromise the high dignitaries in the eyes of the masses in matter relative to the criminal code: treason, espionage, traffic in exchange. This explains why Budapest was chosen for the first theater of operations. Poland, too profoundly Catholic, was more difficult to trouble. In Czechoslovakia Msgr. Beran, Archbishop of Prague, an old resistant, could not be made guilty of treason. In Hungary, on the contrary, Cardinal Mindszenty did not hide his monarchistic and anti-Communistic sentiments. The operation was all the better realized because some other religious sects, cunningly remunerated, agreed not to act or make cause with the Primate.

The results are known. The process of the Bulgarian pastors is only a replica of the Mindszenty process improved. In less than two months two Churches have undergone a terrible assault from the part of the established powers. In both cases, without any doubt, the Communist party intended to crush those spiritual powers which know no frontiers, and for this reason run contrary to Stalinian ambitions. Georges Penchenier

* * * *

UNITY IN THE HIGHWAYS AND BYWAYS

History seems to inform us that Christ's Passion on the Cross is projected through time in His Mystical Body, the Church. As the world assailed

Him in the Flesh, so has it continued to rage against Him in His Church, either by persecution from without or by some form of caesaropapistic machinations from within. Today it prefers militaristic atheism and resorts to both strategies. To gain its destructive aim, it exploits the ignorance and misery of those in the war-torn nations of Europe who believe themselves to be Catholics. Christ's oppressors played their rôle in the divinely ordained Sacrifice by pressing from His side, as it were, a flood of divine Love for their own salvation. Is it not the part of his faithful followers to respond to the world's onslaught with a flood of charity upon the masses which are being won by those who conspire against Christ in His Church?

A comparison of the last century's vicissitudes with our own shows certain similarities. There is a sterling son of Rome who lived in that period whose course of action offers an illuminating example to Catholics of today. He is the Venerable Vincent Pallotti, founder of the Pallottini Fathers, who lived between the years 1795 and 1850. During his life span three Popes were driven from Rome, and violent campaigns followed one another in the Eternal City to tear the Roman faithful from their Church. Then as today, political powers used persuasion, coercion, insidious propaganda, and Godless education to sever them from their allegiance to the Catholic Church whose destruction was their goal. This scene in the drama of the world's assault of the Church which must prevail was played in a setting of bloody wars and the misery they draw behind them.

Vincent Pallotti sensed the horror of the sacriligious blows against Christ's Vicar, the principle and sine-qua-non of Christian unity. He likewise sensed the pathos of his beloved Roman people being won from their true shepherd by the political hirelings. He responded to the call of a suffering Church with the foundation of two great works. One was the *Octave of the Epiphany* for the universal triumph of Christ's one Church. The other was the *Catholic Apostolate* designed to win back the erring children of the Church through a rush of Catholics, especially of the laity, into their midst with prayers for grace, instruction to remedy their ignorance, and prodigious acts of mercy to succor their misery.

These two foundations prefigure and prepare for two eminent movements of our own day: The return of dissident Christians to the True Church, exemplified by the Octave of Prayer for Unity, and Catholic Action. Let it be recalled that one man conceived two foundations. Are they not, as a matter of fact, two phases of one sole movement, that is, Unity and the immediate means to that end? For the sake of Christ's Unity Pallotti with his companions first went carrying Christ to his neighbors, to the Roman *popolo*. Solidarity must be achieved at home if the divine blessing of Unity is to be carried fruitfully to the multitudes abroad, and this solidarity depends upon the merciful solicitude of Catholics for the brothers who are turning their

backs to them. Christ's Kingdom demands Christ's love, and He offered His life for those who were putting Him to death.

A passage written by Pallotti, protagonist of Unity through the Catholic Apostolate, may assist in orientating today's Catholics in their endeavors:

"Be he a priest, be he a layman, a religious or a secular, anyone can put at the disposition of the Work (The Catholic Apostolate) his talents, science, erudition, studies, power, high-station, relations, profession, art, word, his goods, and if he has nothing else, his prayers, sacrifices and mortifications. Wherefore, all, sovereigns and subjects, the great and the small, the high and the low, the learned, the students, the ignorant, the rich and the poor, priests and laymen, regulars and seculars living in society or in solitude, businessmen, merchants, public and private employees, professionists, artists, craftsmen, each one in his own state, in his own condition, according to his own possibilities, can consecrate himself to the work of the Catholic Apostolate to defend, increase, and diffuse faith and charity, and propagate it in the whole world." (I Racc. 95-96).

S. B.

News

AMERICAN CHRONICLE

The annual Conference on Eastern Rites and Liturgies took place at Fordham University, New York City, for the eleventh time on April 1. The topic for the session was an urgent and timely one: *Rites and Rights in the Homeland of Our Savior.* Once Christian knights went forth on horseback in flashing armor to do battle in defense of the shrines sacred to Our Lord. In this year of 1949, with the Holy Places menaced again, their New York descendants arose to the same holy cause in the white field of thought.

The Collins auditorium was attended by an overflowing crowd, of about 1500 persons including Catholics and non-Catholics. Many friends from the dissident Oriental Churches were present. The custody of the Holy Land with its intricately involved problems was discussed by the Very Reverend Thomas Plassman, O.F.M.; its recent history was given by the Right Reverend James H. Griffiths; and from the experience of his recent four months visit in Palestine in the interests of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, Monsignor Thomas J. McMahon gave an account of the Church as it is found in that torn and suffering land today.

On Saturday morning, April 2, more than 3,000 people assisted at a magnificent Concelebration of the Holy Liturgy in Byzantine Rite. The one divine Sacrifice was offered by three con-celebrants, in Hungarian, Slavonic, and Romanian. The intention of the Mass was for Cardinal Mindszenty. Cardinal Spellman, speaking from his throne, remarked that he knew of no place in the world where the Holy Father's anniversary would be so uniquely celebrated and he sent the good wishes of the throngs present to His Holiness to console him in these days of affliction. Hundreds received Holy Communion under two species.

The Fordham Conferences were founded in 1938 as a response to Pope Pius XI's order for an Oriental day to be observed in Catholic houses of learning. The field was found ripe since already groups and individuals of unique education and experience in Oriental matters had been working vigorously for greater appreciation of the Eastern Rites, and for better understanding and informed sympathy and mutual love between the Eastern and Western Churches. It was a vital matter in the United States where there were a half million Eastern Catholics, far too isolated among the many millions of Latin Rite faithful. It was a distinguished committee indeed which organized the first Fordham Conference on Eastern Rites and gathered together a rich exhibition of Byzantine icons, vestments, and books. The year 1942 marked an innovation. Under the patronage of Archbishop Spellman, St. Patrick's Cathedral was opened to them for a celebration of the Byzantine-Slavonic liturgy at which he presided. The Conference has since grown to vaster proportions, has enlarged its sphere of influence, and has extended

its program so that it now conducts numerous Liturgies and conferences from month to month. Its object has remained that of its foundation, the desire of the Holy See to diffuse among Western Catholics knowledge of the venerable dignity of the Eastern Christian Churches, of the beauty of the Oriental Rites, and of the coequality of all Rites, Oriental and Latin.

The St. Paul Guild, whose special purpose is assistance of non-Catholic ministers upon their entrance into the Catholic Church, is celebrating the fifteenth anniversary of its quarterly organ, *The Epistle,* with the forthcoming number. At the same time it is commemorating the forty-eighth year of the Guild's existence. One of the features is Fulton Oursler's story of his conversion. He is a renowned editor, radio orator, and playwright. A letter of congratulation from Cardinal Spellman, honorary president, is included in the issue. Monsignor McMahon, present Spiritual Director, contributes a commemorative editorial. Only recently two more Episcopalian ministers entered the Church, and the Guild continues its providential work of aiding such converts materially.

Not to be neglected in chronicles of convert making is the *Apostolate for the Colored* now being conducted in a great many dioceses of the United States. Although only a small percentage of the huge colored population is Catholic, many thousands of converts are being received annually. In New York City, under the leadership of Monsignor William R. McCann, pastor of St. Charles Parish, it is estimated that nearly ten thousand converts of Negro race have been received into the Church in recent years.

American priests have special problems in the many non-Catholics they come upon in their hospital work. It is a common practice of the priests to speak with non-Catholic patients, and if these welcome it, to tell them the rudimentary prayers necessary in preparing oneself for death. Thus the required beliefs in God, the Trinity, and the Incarnation are taught to receptive people, and the road to eternity is prepared for those to whom the actual gift of faith may not be forthcoming. This is called the *Apostolate to the Dying.*

Thomas J. McMahon

* * * *

ROME

Week of Study on the Philosophy of Communism

St. Thomas's ageless wisdom was brought to bear upon the principal ill of today's thought in an important week of study which took place in the Cancelleria during Low Week. The week's series of conferences was held under the auspices of the Pontifical Roman Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas and of Catholic Religion. The attendance was large, distinguished, and enthusiastic.

Fr. Charles Boyer, S.J., Secretary of the Academy, opened the Week

in a talk which presented reason as the most potent adversary of any erroneous system. He stated that the problems of God, of moral and sociology, economic progress, value of the person, and human liberty were fundamental requisites for consideration in reference to an examination of Communistic philosophy, and that these problems would be dealt with during the week's studies.

The speakers and their topics were as follows: Prof. Giorgio La Pira: *Marxism and Christianity, two antithetical theologies;* Fr. Ugo Viglino, *The social function of property and its metaphysical foundation;* Fr. Reginald Garigou-Lagrange, O.P., *De subordinatione Status obtinendae perfectioni personae humanae secundum S. Thomam;* Prof. Amedeo Giannini, *Doctrine of the Soviet State and society in the Soviet nations;* Fr. Gustave Gundlach, S.J., *Communism as an economic system;* Prof. Francesco Dominedo, *Communism and Democracy;* Fr. Gabriel M. Roschini, O.S.M., *The condition of woman in the Communistic regime;* Msgr. Emilio Lattanzi, *The best argument against Communism;* Professoressa Bianca Magnino, *The Communist ideology and the philosophical problem of truth;* Prof. Igino Giordani, *The political atheism of Communism;* Prof. Ferdinand Storchi, *Free syndacalism and Marxist syndacalism;* Dr. Giovanni Lume, *Labor in Russia;* Fr. Eugenio Toccafondi, O.P., *Spiritual values and the economic factor;* Fr. Carlo Caravaggi, S.J., *Human value and Marxism;* Prof. P. Cornelio Fabro, C.P.S., *Refutation of Communist ideology;* Prof. Joseph Bettiol, *Marxism and penal law;* Msgr. Gedeon Peterffy, *Ethics of Communism;* Prof. Ludovico De Simone, *Person: Thomistic affirmation and Communistic negation;* Fr. Luigi Bogliolo, Sales., *Communism and metaphysical values;* Fr. Gustave A. Wetter, S.J., *Science in Soviet culture;* Fr. Felice Morlion, O.P., *Communism as a psychological complex;* Msgr. Pietro Pavan, *Liberty of man in Communism.*

Interest in the conferences was not a little abetted by the presence of Marxist disciples in the audience. While the free discussion were often of a lively nature, they were at all times carried on in an orderly fashion and with mutual respect. However, objections to the enlightened and well grounded points of the scholars for the greater part took on the character of a predetermined emotional defense of a cherished ideal. Fr. Morlion gave the results of a more or less extensive survey which showed that Communists in Italy had not yet become either anti-Christian or anti-religious. His evidence showed rather that misery, poverty, and lack of security largely motivated Communistic sympathy here. It was still more basically the outcome of pessimism, in that many men, despairing of changing themselves, felt that they could not be improved unless they changed society. He accepted the invitation of the Communists to attend their meetings and carry on the discussions there, felicitating them upon such freedom possible only where Communism had not yet gained control.

Texts of the lectures and communications will be published in the next number of the Academy's quarterly publication *Doctor Communis.*

Pope Names Msgr. McMahon President of New Pontifical Commission for Palestine

The Osservatore Romano of June 4 announces the creation of a *Pontifical Commission for Palestine* to coordinate and administer the charities arising from various nations in favor of the refugees and victims of the recent Palestine conflict. These charities will be carried on in the name of the Holy Father. His Holiness has appointed Msgr. Thomas J. McMahon as President of the *Commission.*

* * * *

ENGLAND

The Anglican Hierarchy Questions Relations of Church and State

The Church Assembly of the Church of England discussed the question of Church and State in its spring session. The opinion was held generally that the ties binding the Church to the State must be relaxed to permit more effective action upon the spiritually chaotic and faith-starved population. After lengthy debate, the following resolution was carried almost unanimously:

"That the Assembly, while valuing the Establishment of the Church of England as an expression of the nation's recognition of religion, nevertheless is of opinion that the present form of it impedes the fulfillment of the responsibility of the Church as a spiritual society and therefore instructs the standing committee to appoint a small commission to draw up resolutions on changes desirable in the relationship between Church and State and to present them to the Assembly for consideration at an early date."

Archbishop Cyril F. Garbett of York, deputy leader of the national church, observed that the Bishops were nominated by the Prime Minister who could be other than a member of the Anglican Communion. The majority of members of the House of Commons are not members of the Church. In ecclesiastical suits, the final court of appeal is a court appointed by the State. For years, entanglements have paralyzed its actions. The future could bring grave dangers, since totalitarianism is on the ascendancy, and while one would like to think that there could never be a hostile government in England using its power to subordinate the Church to its own ends, one would not have thought this possible in other countries twenty years ago. He opposed complete disestablishment, since this would be regarded as a national repudiation of religion at a critical hour of the faith, but he favored a change in the relation between the Church and the State. The archbishop of Canterbury concurred in this, and pointed out that "Canterbury and York, whether they like it or not, were committed already to a line of action which was bound to affect the relations between Church and State."

The Established Church of England comprises two provinces (Canterbury and York), with 41 Bishops and 40 Suffragan Bishops. Scotland has a separate established church of Presbyterian profession. Wales has no established church. The Official Year Book of the Church of England for 1949 presents statistics which it states, "give ground for grave uneasiness." The number of church members who performed their Easter duties in 1947 is 1,859,115 compared with 2,134,897 in 1940. The Catholic population now numbers 2,500,000. The total population of England in 1945 was 36,695,000.

It will be recalled that the King remains the highest ecclesiastical authority of the English Established Church. "A Legal Correspondent" writing in *The Tablet* (Apr. 23, 1949) says: "It was the misfortune of the Established Church that from the beginning it had no power in its own right to define the doctrines of the Christian faith or to formulate canons or rules of ecclesiastical discipline. It had no real control over 'the King's Ecclesiastical Courts.' The standard of orthodox dogma and orthodox ritual in the 'new Anglican Church' was directly fixed by law. And no body other than Parliament had power to alter that standard."

On its part, however, the State no longer functions as the protector of its church. *The Tablet* author continues: "In the long course of time, in 1917, the Law Lords declared, by a majority of four to one, that Christianity is no longer part of the law of England. 'My lords,' said Lord Sumner, in what may fairly be taken to be the leading judgment, 'with all respect for the great names of the lawyers who have used it, the phrase *Christianity is part of the law of England* is really not law, it is rhetoric.' " He then cites a legal historian:

"It is true that there is still an established Church; that the King is still its supreme governor, and the defender of its faith; that its law is still the King's ecclesiastical law, and an integral part of the law of England. But, like many other parts of the law and constitution of England, these are survivals of an older order, from which all real meaning has departed, with the abandonment of that medieval theory of relationship of Church to State, to which they owed their origin. . . . Thus, the old theories upon which the relation of State to Church were based, and, consequently, both the old doctrine as to the relation of English law to Christianity, and the technical rules which depended on that doctrine, have been swept away."[1]

Yet, the dependency of the English Church upon the State's sovereign authority remains in law. Every measure passed by the church's assembly must be submitted to an ecclesiastical committee of 15 members of the House of Lords and of 15 members of the House of Commons. Thus the Established Church remains unable of itself to modify the *Book of Common Prayer* or the Thirty-nine Articles. If, for example, the Anglican hierarchy should be

1) Holdsworth, History of English Law, viii, 403-4, 418.

obliged to acknowledge that the meaning of the Thirty-nine Articles was none other than that given them by their composers, and should then attempt to give them a more liberal character to speed a "comprehensive" union with the Noncomformists (e.g., Art. XXIII), or on the other hand if they should decide to stiffen the sense of tradition and dogma in them (e.g., Art. XXI) to concord with dissident Oriental doctrine and thus remove an obstacle to recognition of Orders by the eastern autocephalic Churches, the Crown would once again need to brace its pious back to the apostolic mission of teaching, and accept responsibility for the ultimate judgment.[2]

Vigorous Catholic Life at Nottingham

During the past year of 1948 three new churches were opened in the diocese of Nottingham to provide for the faithful which increased by approximately 4,000 members in that year. His Excellency, Edward Ellis, Bishop of Nottingham, reports an increase of more than 3,000 faithful making Easter duties, and 1,246 children added to the enrollment of the parochial schools. The Bishop is encouraged to find that the increase is manifestly not that of Catholics in name alone, but in very deed. (Oss. Rom.)

Centenary of the Jesuits' Return to England

This year marks the first centenary of the installation of the Jesuits at Farm Street after three centuries of exile. There are now 850 Jesuits in England. They possess 46 houses with colleges and various institutions. They also direct university houses at Oxford and London. In view of the day's special needs, they have recently founded a Workers' College at Oxford. Their periodical, *The Month,* is widely read by both Catholics and non-Catholics. (CIP)

Proposal to Revise Book of Common Prayer

Dr. Cyril F. Garbett, Bishop of York, addressing a northern England Convocation of Bishops in May, proposed that the Church of England officially revise the *Book of Common Prayer.* He suggested that a revised Book be approved on a permissive basis without request for parliamentary sanction. Since the English Church is established by law with the King as "defender of the faith" at its head, Parliament's approval would be required to give legal authority to a revised *Book of Common Prayer.* Parliament has already rejected suggested revisions in 1927 and 1928.

The Archbishop urged agreement on revision to avoid ruining unity of worship. He explained that pastors have been experimenting with the Book, making many departures according to their own notions, and publishing texts which have no authority behind them. He said, "It is assumed that liturgical wisdom, which the Holy Spirit has apparently withheld from the Episcopate, has been granted abundantly to every parish priest." He proposed

2) Cf. Results of Unity Conversations in England; Moscow Synod Examines Anglican Ordinations.

that approval of suggested revisions be given by clergy and laity together with the Bishops. (AP)

* * * *

CANADA

Union of Anglicans and Free Confessions Proposed

A conference of pastors and laymen took place at Toronto to examine the possibility of uniting the Anglican community with that of the United Church of Canada. In 1943 upon the invitation of a general Anglican synod, the Presbyterians, Baptists, and others declined the invitation. A conclusive action is expected in a general Anglican synod to be held in September at Halifax. Reports will be submitted to a commission of 60 members appointed by the two parties. Acknowledgment of authoritative ministry of all pastors will be an important point in question. A proposition destined to give the pastors authority acceptable to the whole body has already been approved by a committee of 30 members and sent to the parishes for examination two years ago.

* * * *

FRANCE

Evidence of Collaboration between Progressive Christians and Communists

The National Secretariate of the "Union of Progressive Christians" requested the weekly *l'Homme Nouveau* to print a communication in which it was stated "One could only with a grievous abuse of terms speak of the recent communiqué of His Eminence Cardinal Suhard in reference to a 'condemnation of Progressive Christians.'" The message continues, saying that its movement is "independent in respect to all political parties; it follows a precise and limited activity for the defense of peace, for the realization of a true French Union, and for social justice."

The Cardinal had in fact said that the Progressive Christians had adopted a policy of collaboration with the Communist party, and that this collaboration contributes to the success of that party; that the triumph of the party would mark a withdrawal from faith in God, an unjust limitation of the Church's liberties and of recourse tototalitarian political methods calked on Marxist theory.

The Cardinal's affirmation is made evident, in spite of the protestations of the accused Union, by various public declarations of its own members. In a speech given by M. Denis which may be considered as the first official program of the Progressive Christians, the following statements were made:

"There remains one solution, which is that of K. Marx, that of Lenin, which is that of the Communists and which is that which we adopt. I can

inform you that we have made contact with the Communists. . . . We have chosen. Our choice has been tried and matured by common and fraternal activity with the Communist militants. A number of us have, in fact, been members of the Communist Party. We do not think, in deed, that it should be in any way forbidden to a Christian, to a Catholic, to belong to the Communist party."

Likewise, the publication of the Union of Progressive Christians, *Des Chrétiens prennent position,* has explicitly said, "The ecclesiastical Hierarchy serves class interest when it unjustly gives a spiritual consecration to anti-Communism. . . . We have the choice between Fascist barbarism and regenerating Marxism. We must choose the struggle upon the political terrain, among the revolutionary forces. Our choice is made." *(l'Homme Nouveau)*

Intense spiritual forces are incontestably alive in the disillusioned post-war France. Multitudes of earnest people are working, thinking, acting, and praying for a new and purified society. Among these are Catholics, working dynamically, their sleeves rolled up, so to speak, but with their feet firmly planted upon the firm rock of the Faith. Others lack a clear vision of the whole Faith, and have failed to confide in their divinely authorized Hierarchy, which alone is able to say what the true Faith is. Sadly enough, they are clutching for their longed for security in a mere illusion of justice and peace. May the sincere efforts of those genuine believers following the lead of their shepherding Hierarchy overcome the fearsome quandaries of their brothers, and gain the grace of charity through their labors and prayers to fill the menacing breach which has opened between many French Christians and Christ Who lives in their Church.

Participation of the Faithful in the Liturgy

Unity of men in Christ is actually lived in the liturgy. The Eucharistic Sacrifice is the living source which both feeds the spirit of unity and spreads it abroad. Cardinal Suhard, exceptionally sensitive to the needs of today's chaotic and divided society, is promoting the movement which has become vigorous in France, of participation in the liturgy according to a whole mind and heart. He says in a communiqué to *la Semaine Religieuse,* "It is truly urgent that the faithful assist at the sacred ceremonies other than as dumb and foreign spectators." The text continues with more precise directions on how one may assist fruitfully at the sacred functions, and with the caution that only the Sovereign Pontiff has the power to regulate divine worship.

Protestant Religious Make Vows at Taizé-lès-Cluny

On Easter Sunday seven Brothers took final vows in the Protestant community of Taizé-lès-Cluny. The elder Brother or Superior of the Community is Roger Schütz; another Brother is Max Thurian, who is widely known for his theological and liturgical studies. Among them is also a doctor who will

practice in the region, an itinerant Brother preacher, two farmers who will till the community's grounds, and one other theologian.

The "Cluny" group has been officially recognized by the Reformed Church of France. (It cultivates a friendly attitude toward the Roman Church, and values the relations which it has established among members of the Hierarchy and other eccleciastics.)

This community observes a community of goods and practices celibacy. Two offices of prayer are comprised in the daily program, one of which is at night; that is, at 3:30 A.M. The members have rejected the idea of a precisely formulated rule, and inspire themselves upon three essential principles:

(1) Sanctification of labor and rest by the Word of God.

(2) Search for interior silence.

(3) Spirit of the Beatitudes: joy, simplicity and mercy. This last element is perhaps most marked in the character of the community. (EPS)

The society has been motivated by the conviction that the world is passing through what they see as a period of *preaching*. The word alone no longer makes an effective impression upon modern-day man. They liken the word of preaching to the *verbum Dei*. This word must be lived in actuality, become embodied in actual life, to become the *verbum incarnatum*. They are of the opinion that religious communities form an integral part of the Universal Church's life, and are a necessary aspect of the Body of Christ. Various religious communities have arisen in the past to fulfill a particular mission according to the needs of the day. Our own crucial days demand religious life in community as an answer to particular needs. Individualism and capitalism, they find, have left a fatigued mankind longing for the benefits of the communal spirit in society, while a spiritual weariness following upon a period of exaggerated intellectualism demands a search for living, concrete, creative thought. These young Protestants feel then that they are responding to the prophetic mission of bringing flesh to the word by living the Christian life in community.

They find that community life is in conformity with the Gospels and point out that the finest Christian practice of the past has carried on this tradition. As for celibacy, neither Christ nor St. Paul, they say, spoke of it as something exceptional, but considered it as ordinary as marriage. They give as reference Matthew 19, 12 and I Corinthians 7,32-35. Celibacy, according to them, is not a necessity of the ministry or of Christian life, but is a special vocation complementing them. They emphasize the social value of celibacy. Because of sin which has entered into God's work, and because of the outrages which have been committed against marriage, the practice of celibacy should give back to marriage the sense of a divine vocation as a true mystery in God.

They have discovered that basic Protestant principles do not forbid community life. Brother Thurian says, ". . . neither Luther nor Calvin opposed the principle of community life. We found an important text of Luther dating from 1536, quite to the contrary. It has to do with a protocol under the name of *Articles of Wittenberg,* which resumes conversations of Luther with the envoys of the King of England come to inquire how they should carry out the Reform. The essential passages of Article XV, entitled *De Votis Monasticis,* speak of correcting opinions and impious cults, while preserving colleges and monasteries; since study of books is insufficient for a virtuous life, the young should be trained in a religious discipline. The document continues, "we do not condemn that some who are particularly qualified for the monastic state prefer to live in the colleges, once the opinions and forms of worship have been corrected, provided they use their vows as an indifferent thing; on the contrary, knowing that many holy and remarkable men have lived a Christian life in monasteries, and animated by these sentiments, it is our wish that there exist such colleges of learned men consecrated to God where the study of Christian doctrine will be followed for the common usefulness of the Church. . . ."[1]

The Taizé-lès-Cluny community had its beginnings more than ten years ago among a group of Lausanne University students who gathered about Pastor Roger Schütz in a desire for spiritual discipline and direction of intellectual studies according to the Christian way. They formed a sort of Third Order in 1940 which they called the "Grande Communauté." A chateau was bought for them in Bourgogne to serve as a house for retreats, and Pastor Schütz took up residence there, awaiting the formation of a religious community. Two Brothers joined him, but in 1942 the invasion of France obliged the nascent order to withdraw to Geneva where they lived as much as possible according to the spirit of Port-Royal. The group grew to four in number, and became orientated upon a Franciscan conception of fraternal life. The community entered the present house at Taizé, near Cluny, France, in 1944.

The interests of the society include the care of orphans, retreats, intellectual work, and the promotion of ecumenism. Among the chief aims is the realization of the unity of all Christians in one faith and one church. (Cf. Max Thurian, *La Communauté de Cluny,* Verbum Caro, Sept., 1948.)

* * * *

UNITED STATES

Conversion Work

There are fifty different information centers in the diocese of Brooklyn where courses of Catholic instruction are given to non-Catholics. Bishop

1) Max Thurian, *La Communaute de Cluny,* Verbum Caro, Basle, Sept. 1948, p. 112.

Molloy described the apostolate's weekly instruction course as "an opportunity of receiving sound Catholic religious doctrine and of correcting, perhaps, erroneous opinions concerning Catholic faith and practice." A complete and systematic explanation of the Catholic Church is given at the many information centers, at which non-Catholics may attend with absolutely no obligation following upon their attendance.

In the Protestant south, in the town of Lexington, Kentucky, a convert club now called the Guild of St. Paul has been working for the past twelve years for the assistance of new converts. It is a parish organization, typical of many to be found throughout the country. Its purposes are: first, to help new converts to adjust themselves to their new religion, to introduce them to the various parish societies, and to continue to deepen the Christian way of life in their souls; and second, to spread the Faith. It has been found that the converts have provided the largest number of new contacts which have led to further conversions. Since the Lexington Guild was founded, there have been at least 25 instances in which both husband and wife became converts, and in which one led the other into the Church. Activities center around monthly meetings. Programs are varied. At some, speakers talk on Catholic subjects. Others include round-table discussions, question and answer sessions, and slides or moving pictures on religious topics. Still others are purely social affairs.

The Narberth Movement, Catholic information society founded by a few Pennsylvania laymen which grew to a world-wide status, was twenty years old on March 19. The movement began with a group of eight men of Narberth, Pennsylvania, who started to mail small Catholic information leaflets to 500 of their nearby non-Catholic friends. From the mailing of leaflets the movement branched into newspaper articles. At the present time at least 336 "Narberth" groups are supplying 425 newspapers with Catholic articles. The movement is now found in 47 States and seven other nations.

After the death of the leader of the movement, Mr. Rogers, in 1942, his wife, who had acted as his secretary and advisor, entered the Visitation convent in Richmond, Virginia. Acording to his wishes, the Narberth Movement was taken over by the National (*American*) Council of Catholic Men.

Decease of Father Hugh Diman, O.S.B.

We wish to express our profound sorrow on the loss of an outstanding American Churchman. The Rev. John Hugh Diman, O.S.B., died at the age of 85 on March 17 at Portsmouth Priory, R. I. This former Prior of Portsmouth Priory had left Anglicanism to embrace the Catholic Faith in 1917. While yet an Anglican he founded the well known St. George's School of Middletown, R. I., and the Diman Vocational School of Fall River, Mass. He founded the Portsmouth Priory School in 1926. After his entry to the Church he studied at Oxford and at the Academy for Noble Ecclesiastics

in Rome. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1921, entered the Abbey of Fort Augustus, Scotland, in 1923, and returned to America in 1924. Countless souls, both Catholic and non-Catholic, will remember his enlightening influence with gratitude.

Msgr. McMahon submits memorandum on Holy Places of Jerusalem to U.N.

Msgr. Thomas J. McMahon, National Secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, returned from a four-month visit to Palestine, submitted a memorandum to the Hon. Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the U.N. on March 21. He finds that in view of recent statements of the Israeli government it is necessary to insist before the United Nations "on certain rights, religious and humanitarian, which are being obscured." He recalled Pope Pius XII's declarations on the necessity of guaranteeing the safety of Jerusalem and its vicinity. He noted that to the question of Jerusalem there are joined the solutions for Bethlehem, now in Arab territory, and Nazareth, now under Israeli occupation. After recalling that since these places had been sanctified by Christ, Christians are justified in demanding their international status, he quoted from the Australian statement made in Paris: "The plan for Jerusalem and the Holy Places was and remains a cardinal feature of the Assembly's recommendation. . . . These places cannot be said to be exclusive property of the Jews or Arabs, Christians or non-Christians. . . . Last year the delegations, particularly of Australia and of France, not only drew specific attention to the international nature of this problem but put forward positive proposals relating to the safeguarding inter alia of the Christian Churches, which were accepted, and we do not intend to abandon the principle, then expressly stated and supported by us. Jerusalem and the Holy Places engage not only the sentiments but the sacred interests of the great mass of mankind."

Msgr. McMahon expressed a second grave concern, that of the status of refugees who have fled from homes now located in the State of Israel. Some will return to their ancestral homes in Arab territory after the fixing of boundaries, but the publicly proposed solution of Israeli officials cannot be submitted to. These would forbid the refugees to return to the homes in which their families had dwelt for many generations and force them to take up permanent abode in Arab country outside Israeli. Catholic institutions, churches, schools, hospitals and orphanages built from centuries back for these people remain without faithful to serve. Both a humanitarian problem and one of justice are involved. (NCWC)

* * * *

SWITZERLAND

Interdiction of the Jesuit Order Discussed

A recent debate in the National Council of the Helvetian Confederation

on the laws against Jesuits in Switzerland has aroused some public discussion. *La Vie Protestante* of Geneva publishes the following comments:

"Art. 51 of our Constitution prohibits the institution in Switzerland of the Order of Jesus with all the consequences which such a prohibition bears with it. It is inadmissable that this article be continually violated by those who have sworn to observe and to uphold the Constitution. If for reasons which each one is free to champion in our authentic 'popular democracy' it is held to be out-moded and unjust, let it be abrogated. This abrogation may be obtained legally, and no one objects to having the question placed clearly before the Swiss people. Let the Catholic Church (or its representatives), which declares itself harmed by this provision, take the initiative. The people will decide upon it." (CIP)

While one hears voices of outstanding Protestants demanding that the Catholics be given the freedom of religion, for which they themselves fought in the sixteenth century, and although the discussion continues, the Catholic authorities feel that the anti-Catholic convictions are still deep-rooted enough to warrant postponing action against the restrictions, however such an act might be justified.

The original interdiction of the Jesuits occurred in 1848, formulated in an article 58. It was the result of a widespread accusation that the Jesuits had instigated the Sonderblund. Pastor Grin of Lausanne says on this matter, "Recently Protestant as well as Catholic historians have applied themselves to this problem and have consulted the archives of the Company of Jesus. Both Protestants and Catholics affirm that it is impossible to establish by any document that the Jesuits were personally implicated in the Sonderblund affair."

The Article 58 was replaced by Articles 51 and 52 of 1874, which read: Article 51. "The Order of Jesuits and affiliated societies may not be received in any part of Switzerland and every activity in church or school is forbidden their members.

"This interdiction may by federal ordinance extend to other religious organizations whose action is dangerous to the State or which troubles peace among confessions." Article 52. "It is forbidden to found new convents or religious orders, or to reestablish those which have been suppressed."

This aggravation of the original legislation was a consequence of the Swiss *Kulturkampf*. In these last three fourths of a century, however, spirits have been pacified, relations between the confessions have been improved, a clearer mutual understanding has been achieved, and a more favorable atmosphere is being formed in which to eliminate the last traces of the *Kulturkampf*. The injustice against the religion of Switzerland's founders becomes all the more pointed in view of the fact the Communists are left to organize their cells freely.

SPAIN

Reported Government Intolerance of Protestants Clarified

It has been widely published that Protestants in Spain are persecuted and that freedom of worship is denied by the state. Dr. Richard Pattee, director of the Pan-American Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, has published in *Columbia* an analysis of the situation which shows that the charge is the result of misinterpretation, and that in fact there is no persecution in Spain either by the government or by the Catholic Church.

The following information is gathered from his analysis:

The status of religion in Spain is governed by article 6 of the *Fuero de los Espanoles,* loosely termed the Spaniard's Charter. It reads, "The profession and practice of the Catholic religion, which is that of the Spanish State shall enjoy official protection. None shall be molested for their religious beliefs or their private practice. No other ceremonies or external demonstrations than those of the Catholic religion shall be permitted." Nothing in this article proposes the persecution or elimination of any religious minority. The one substantial restriction is that concerning public demonstration of religion, which would be offensive to the majority of the Spanish people of whom 98 per cent regard Catholicism as the only true religion. Prudence would dictate that Protestant demonstrations be restricted in this overwhelmingly Catholic people.

Private practice of religion permits Protestants to have their own churches and chapels and to hold services for their communicants. One hundred and sixty-five Protestant chapels and church buildings now exist in Spain.

The Catholic Hierarchy expresses the Church's attitude in a joint pastoral letter issued in June, 1948: "Blessed be the hour—and may God hasten it—in which attacks against the Catholic Church on the part of all religious confessions which acknowledge Christ may cease and in which the efforts of all who believe in Jesus and in the values of the spirit against materialism and its consequences in the social and political order may be joined." The call for cessation of anti-Catholic attacks is explained by the Protestant progaganda which the Protestant leaders acknowledge has been aggressively anti-Catholic. Dr. Pattee writes: "Devotion to the Saints, clerical celibacy, devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and numerous other practices and doctrines of the Church have been attacked with singular violence" in tracts and pious books distributed by Protestant missionaries.

Moreover, the Spanish Bishops, in their efforts to overcome materialism, must preserve the purity of the Faith, and are unable to adopt the view that the faithful are free to adhere to any church. The question of religious toleration beside being political and social, can become theological, involving the right of the Church to protect the integrity of the Faith.

The anti-Protestant incidents which have occurred in recent years are explained by a strongly traditionalist political group known as the *Requetes* who are dissatisfied with what they regard as the government's "soft" treatment of non-Catholic religious groups. The acts of vandalism and intolerance have been condemned by the proper ecclesiastical authority and the responsible persons arrested. In nearly all instances, the government provided indemnity for the damaged churches, and in some instances placed effective guards around chapels for added protection.

Protestants have complained that they suffer disabilities in matters of marriage, burial and schools. Dr. Pattee says the charge that marriage is not valid unless performed by a priest is a misstatement. Under 1938 legislation, a Church marriage is obligatory for Catholics, and a civil marriage for non-Catholics. Non-Catholic couples may have a church ceremony after civil marriage. They are free on the matter of burial insomuch as in almost every Spanish town or village there is a second cemetery for those who die outside the Church or who are non-Catholics.

There is no legislation hindering the right of Protestants to educate their children according to their religious beliefs. The fact is that the number of Protestant school children is so small that it could not warrant setting up a special school system for them. The author estimates that there are about 7,000 native Protestants spread throughout Spain. He says, "If these 7,000 included 1,000 children of school age, it would seem absurd to establish a school system exclusively for this microscopic minority, much less secondary schools and institutions of higher learning. . . . Although not formal institutions of instruction, registered according to the law, there are Protestant schools in Spain, and they exist among the very tiny communities to afford religious instruction to children of this persuasion who frequent the State schools." (NCWC)

Promotion of Unity through Prayer Movement

Daily work for Unity is encouraged by a Crusade for prayers which has been organized throughout Spain by the OMDOC (Missionary Movement of the Christian Orient). Leaflets are offered to the public containing prayers of three grades: for children, adults, and priests or religious. These prayers, together with obligations of attending the Octave of Prayer for Unity, and the Oriental Day, have been granted indulgences by 35 different Bishops for their dioceses. The purpose of the Crusade of Prayer is to achieve Union with the Catholic Church of all Christians who are separated from her. Catholics are reminded that this Unity is the great desire of Jesus Christ expressed in his prayer to the Father before His Passion, and which has been recalled by repeated exhortations of the Popes and by the Sacred Oriental Congregation. (Oriente)

Dialogue Mass in Greek Rite

At Santiago di Campostello, Spain, on January 23, during the Octave of Prayer for Unity, a dialogue Mass was celebrated in Greek rite. The people followed with the help of a booklet called "*Dialogad la Santa Misa en rito oriental,*" and instructions given from the pulpit. The opulent and symbolical text of the Oriental Mass loaned itself gracefully to the dialogue form and inspired the faithful to a fervent participation in the divine Sacrifice.

The Mass was celebrated by Fr. Santiago Morillo, S.J., professor of Greek in the University del Genil, Grenada, who has devoted himself to the cause of the Christian Orient. (Oriente)

* * * *

GREENLAND

First Church in the Western Hemisphere

A curious gift to an American chaplain turns our minds to the Church that was once and is no longer in Greenland. The Danish authorities of Greenland have presented the Rev. James P. McDermott, Chaplain of the U. S. Air Corps base in that country, with some stones taken from the first church built in Greenland, and which was, in fact, the first in the whole western hemisphere.

Ruins of the church's foundations still exist at Karsiarssak. It was built by the mother of Lief the Lucky and dedicated in the year 1002. The village of Karsiarssak is in the valley of Narsarrsuak, where Erik the Red first made his home when he came to Greenland in 982 as an exile from Iceland. Erik's son Lief, a gentle, scholarly and reflective sort, brought Christianity back with him from Norway where he had been sent to study. He Christianized the population which was made up of about 1,000 Icelanders whom Erik had attracted there by his fantastically alluring accounts of the country's richness. He it was who gave that land the name of *green,* not because of its actual verdure, but because of the attractive ring that word would have in the ears of prospective settlers.

One account tells that Lief was ordained to the priesthood in Norway. Others have it that he merely brought a priest back with him. We know, however, that his mother was the first to convert to the Faith, while old Erik continued as fiercely heathen, raging implacably against the new Christian movement which he was unable to stay.

The story of the Church in Greenland becomes nebulous after Erik's time. Fr. McDermott hopes to find reliable information in the Vatican archives, since the Greenland Christians remained in contact with Europe for nearly 400 years. He is unable to carry on personal researches at the site, because the Greenland settlements are closed to the American forces by reason of an agreement made with Denmark. He will deliver his historic

stones to Msgr. James H. Griffiths, Chancellor of the Military Ordinariate under His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, for any necessary investigation of their authenticity. (NCWC)

* * * *

DENMARK

A Catholic Monastery in Denmark

For the first time since the Reform, a Catholic contemplative order has returned to Denmark. A community of Trappists which have departed from the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany have now taken up their life in their own ancient monastery of Oem in Jutland. Both the monastery and the chapel have been completely restored. (CIP)

* * * *

POLAND

Plan of Combat against the Catholic Church

From well informed sources it has been learned that a secret conference of Polish Communist leaders with various delegates from Moscow was held in a district near Warsaw last March. In this conference, CIP (*Centro Informazione e Pubblicazioni,* Rome) informs us, a plan of combat against the Catholic Church was planned in full detail. The Minister Wolski, of Russian origin and member of the Soviet secret police, was designated to direct this offensive. (CIP)

* * * *

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Campaign against the Church Continues

News from Prague shows that pressure against the Catholic Church becomes daily more intense. "Spontaneous" motions and letters from all parts rain upon the Archbishop demanding that he "of his own initiative and so as to be in time" purge the Church of priests who are opposed to the popular democracy. Church properties continue to be expropriated and about 600 priests and laymen, called "collaborators of the Church," are detained in concentration camps of Bohemia and Slovakia. *The Luxemburger Wort* publishes that the clergy is forbidden ration cards for clothing and shoes. If that were necessary, Gottwald clarifies the end which the Communists have in view in an article appearing in the Prague newspaper *Prace Sveta* which states: "Finally we can, without compromise make a reckoning with our dear God and his servants. . . . Dialetical materialism says clearly what the position is of a faithful socialist. Let us have done with the invention of a God and with that moral which has been presented in His name." (CIP)

RUSSIA

Union of Baptists and Evangelicals

Information on the Union of the Baptists and the Evangelical sects is given in *Bratsky Vostnik,* which is its proper organ. The Council of the Union is made up of 10 members, of whom 5 reside in Moscow where there is a central church. Four thousand congregations exist in the U.S.S.R., each headed by a presbyter. The congregations are organized in 70 districts each under its chief presbyter, mostly middle-aged men. Some chief presbyters direct as many as 200 congregations. One-third of the presbyters are maintained by the congregations, while the rest gain their livelihood as workers. Most of the congregations worship in hired rooms and halls. The Union registers some 400,000 members, and about 4 million attend services. Only those licensed by the chief presbyter of the district may preach. (Bolshakoff)

* * * *

GERMANY

A Lutheran Bishop Speaks on the Constitution of the VELKD

The Lutheran Bishop Hans Meiser, on December 31 last, speaking on the constitution of the VELKD (The United Evangelical Lutheran Churches of Germany), declared:

"This constitution has been unanimously accepted by the nine Lutheran Churches of Germany which participated in the Synod of Eisenach in July, 1948 . . . a desire has been realized which dates from more than a century. The Lutheran Churches of Germany . . . have found the way of union for common action. What will be its rôle in the future? We hope that it will contribute much to the spiritual renewal of all Protestantism in Germany, as well as a new Biblical consciousness on the different confessions of the Lutheran churches. It should aid the member-churches to realize a greater uniformity in their constitution, and in a word, strengthen the understanding and the communion between them."

This consitution of the German Lutheran Churches affirms independence from the state in its government. Baptism properly administered is recognized by all the member-churches. After heated discussion it was decided, "In many of the member-churches, the faithful belonging to another community which is incorporated in the EKD (German Evangelical Churches) will be admitted without restriction to the Table of the Lord. In none of the member-churches may Holy Communion be refused to a person belonging to a confession represented in the EKD when pastoral necessities or conditions of the parish demand it." The EKD has the competence of representing ecclesiastical interests in relation to public authorities. The constitution also declares "the EKD collaborates in the ecumenical movement and cultivates ecumenical relations through the intermediary of ecclesiastical organizations and societies."

God-Creator, Foundation of International Law

From an address which was not noted by the Press at the Amsterdam Assembly, we select a basically important concept emphasized by the Lutheran Bishop Eivind Berggrav: "The most important Christian witness in international relations says: *There is one living God. . . .*" He regretted the substitution of the notion *divine nature* for that of *God-Creator*. "The first step of any Christian Church should consist in a common call to the United Nations to demand a foundation of international law upon submission to the eternal law of God, and upon the respect of the obligations and the rights which we receive from our common Creator. Upon this point, there is no opposition between us and Rome." (News Bull., Geneva)

Oriental Church

Moscow Synod Examines Anglican Ordinations

Last July a Synod intended to represent the autocephalous Churches of Oriental rite took place at Moscow. Patriarch Alexis had planned such a Synod for the year 1947 but found it opportune to postpone it since his invitation seemed unwelcome to those beyond the Soviet pale who found it out of place that such an invitation be made by any excepting the Patriarch of Constantinople. In 1948 invitations were sent for a jubilee celebration of the fifth centenary of the Moscow Church's autocephality. The practice of courtesy demanded attendance at the jubilee and Patriarch Alexis succeeded thereby in having a Synod attended also.

The Jubilee was attended by a large representation of the eastern dissident Churches, including delegates of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and Alexandria. The Patriarch of Antioch attended in person. Those not represented were the Patriarch of Jerusalem, dissident Greek Churches of Cyprus, of North America, and the small Church of Hungary. Not all, however, took part in the Synod. Neither the ecumenical Patriarchate nor the Church of Greece were represented in the Conference. At this Synod the question of recognition of Anglican Ordinations was discussed. Although it could be observed that Patriarch Alexis had reasons for seeing the Anglican position in an unfavorable light, the findings of the Conference are apparently consonant with Oriental doctrine. Patriarch Alexis introduced the topic in his opening speech thus:

"We are all in fraternal relations with the Church of England. Only a year ago, the Russian Orthodox Church received from His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury a letter asking her to examine the question of the recognition of the ordinations in the Church of England. This letter told us at the same time that these ordinations were separately recognized by the following Orthodox patriarchates: Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem,

and Rumania. Later we learned of the recognition of Anglican Ordinations by the Bulgarian Church also, a recognition signed in a private capacity. We have few documents on the subject of this recognition, and we have not seen convincing arguments from the dogmatic, canonical, and church historical point of view in favor of it. On account of the difficulty of this question and also on account of the absence of formulated unity in its understanding by different Orthodox local churches we have decided, in order to testify the respect due to our brother in Christ, the archbishop of Canterbury, to ask the assembly of our bishops to resolve this question fraternally. The point of view of the Russian Orthodox Church concerning this question is expounded in the report of one of the professors of the Academy of theology at Moscow. It is to be understood that questions of this kind are extremely complicated. This is so, above all, if we take into account the fact that the head of the Anglican Church is the supreme lay power, the king of England, without whose consent none of the thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican faith can be changed, and that our conversations and acts of agreement with the Anglican clergy can only have a provisional character."

The Conference published the following resolution:

"Having heard the reports 'Concerning Anglican Ordinations,' the Conference of heads and representatives of Orthodox Autocephalous Churches, with a feeling of Christian goodwill and brotherly love for the Anglican Christians in their search for a way towards the *recognition* of the *validity* of Anglican Ordinations decides that:

(1) The teaching of faith contained in the 'thirty-nine Articles' of the Anglican Church definitely differs from the dogmas, faith, and tradition confessed by the Orthodox Church and the solution of the question of the *validity* of Anglican ordinations must first of all be based upon a teaching concerning the sacraments which corresponds with the Orthodox teaching. Private expressions of agreement to alter the teaching of these Articles concerning the sacraments in the direction of an approach to Orthodoxy, when made by members of the Anglican hierarchy, cannot serve as a basis for the positive solution of the question. Therefore, if the Orthodox Church cannot agree to recognize the rightness of Anglican teaching on sacraments in general, and on the sacrament of Holy Orders in particular, neither can she *recognize* Anglican ordinations *as valid*. If the Churches of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Cyprus, Rumania and other autocephalous Churches have favorably commented on the recognition of the *validity* of Anglican Ordinations, we have information that this approval of recognition was provisional.

(2) The question of the recognition of the *validity* of Anglican Orders can be examined only in connection with the other question, of unity of faith and confession with the Orthodox Church, and if an authoritative act of the Anglican Church is made on this subject, proceeding from a council of congress of the clergy of the Anglican Confession, with subsequent confirma-

tion of this by the head of the Anglican Church; such an act does not as yet exist. In this connection, we express the desire that the Anglican Church should alter her teaching of faith from the dogmatic, canonical, and ecclesiological point of view, and, in particular, her authentic conception of the holy sacraments and, more especially, her conception of the sacrament of ordination.

(3) Viewing with all attention and sympathy of the contemporary movement among many representatives of Anglicanism towards the restoration of relations of the communion of the faithful of the Anglican Church with the Ecumenical Church, we state that the contemporary Anglican hierarchy can receive from the Orthodox Church recognition of the grace of its ordinations, if, first of all, a formally expressed unity of faith and confession (as stated above) between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches is established. Such longed for unity being established, recognition of the validity of Anglican Ordinations can be realized according to the principle of economy, by the only possible authoritative method for us, i.e., a decision in council of the whole Holy Orthodox Church."[1]

Conference of Dissident Orientals on Ecumenism

A course on the unity of the Church and ecumenism according to the decision of the rectoral council as a consequence of the Amsterdam Assembly was held at the "*Institut orthodoxe français de Saint-Denis*" at Paris, in February. Rev. Eugraph Kovalevsky, who presided at the meetings, presented the theses of Constantinople, while Protestant and Catholic theologians presented the theses of their proper institutions. (EPS)

Foundation of Chair of Oriental Religions at Oxford

The University of Oxford has received a donation of £42,000 for the creation of a chair of Oriental religions intended to rouse interest in the religions and ethical systems of the Orient. Mr. and Mrs. H. N. Spaldin made the donation to favor better understanding among the great religions.

Convention of Dissident Ukrainian Church in U. S. A.

The dissident Ukrainian Church in America met in Convention on December 8, last, in Allentown, Pennsylvania, to discuss future organization. The 125 clerical and lay delegates at the convention claimed to represent 40,000 of the so-called Ukrainian Autocephalists whose canonical status is uncertain and who have lived as an isolated group for many years. A petition was made to the new Oecumenical Patriarch to establish a new ecclesiastical province to include the American Ukrainian diocese with the Canadian Archdiocese numbering 120,000 people. Formal approval of the new diocese is expected from the Synod of Constantinople.

Circle of Studies for Return of Eastern Dissidents to Unity at Zurich

Circle of studies consecrated to the problem of return of dissident

1) The Rev. E. Every gives a lucid account of the dissident Eastern Church's activities on Anglican Orders in his article *The Eastern Orthodox Church and the Anglican Ordinations*, Eastern Churches Quarterly, Oct.-Dec., 1948.

Orientals to the Catholic Church was founded at Zurich in 1946. This group has its spiritual head in Belgium in the Benedictine Monastery of Sainte-Croix at Chevetogne. This monastery was founded upon the express request of the Holy Father to promote the apostolate of unity. Dom Robert van Cauwelaert has been responsible for the instruction of the Zurich group.

The circle has organized Liturgies in Greek and Slavonic, as well as conferences given by outstanding specialists in this field. They have cultivated friendly contacts with the separated Orientals of their city. From the initiative of this group has sprung manifestations for Christian unity at the Grand Séminaire of Lucerne, at the Colleges of Engelberg, Bellinzone, Bribourg, Schwyz, and at Basle, where a lay devotee of unity has recently founded another circle.

Marriage Rules Published as First Part of Code for Oriental Church

The newly-codified laws on marriage for the Oriental Church have been published in the Acta Apostolicae Sedis. These regulations form a section of what will become the first code of canon law in the history of the Oriental Church. The work was begun in 1929 when the late Pietro Cardinal Gasparri gave the impetus for codification of laws for the Oriental Church. A permanent commission was established in 1935, and the new marriage regulations were set down by Pope Pius XII in a motu proprio, *Crebrae Allatae,* dated February 22. It is expected that the entire code of Oriental Canon Law will be promulgated in the near future.

The section on marriage follows closely the Latin Code with regard to the order, treatment, and mind of legislation. There are, however, some general rules that are new for the members of the Oriental Church, such as provisions regarding publication of marriage banns which previously had been practically unused. Social conditions in the past were of such an intimate nature that the identity, life, and relationships of practically everyone became a matter of common knowledge. With the change of conditions, the publication of banns has become practical in the East also. Historical developments have with time led to divergences in details and practices in various parts of the Orient. These divergences the new Code seeks to rectify and bring to a degree of uniformity. (NCWC)

Separated Orientals in Finland

Two dioceses of separated Orientals still exist in Finland, comprising 29 parishes administered by 38 Priests and faithful to the number of 79,150. The two episcopal sees are at Kuopio and Helsinki. The Archbishop of Kuopio, dependent upon the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, is recognized as head of this Finnish Church.

When Finnish Karelia was ceded to the Soviet Union, 44 parishes out of 64 were lost, along with the Serdobul Seminary and library, many chapels, cemeteries, schools, lands, and institutions. Three great monasteries went to

the Soviet. The Karelians left their ancestral homes to scatter over various parts of Finland.

The clergy is obliged to a rigorous life. Salaries, about half that of the Lutheran ministers, are quite inadequate, and the priests must travel great distances to visit their parishioners. They work zealously, nevertheless, and the laity, dispersed among the Lutherans, cling tenaciously to their faith.

Although the Church itself is under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the three monasteries depend upon Moscow. The great community of Valamo which formerly dwelt on the islands in Lake Ladoga, which passed to the Soviet in 1940, is now located in Central Finland at New Valamo.

The monks, about 100 in number, mostly advanced in age, are of Russian birth. They are obliged to work hard for their livelihood. There are 25 monks in the Konevissa community, and 40 nuns in the Lintula Convent. The future of the religious houses is not encouraging. The Finnish recruits are few and accommodations are wanting for postulants.

It is of interest that the Valamo Monks brought Oriental Christianity to America, landing in Alaska in 1794.

The Political Policy of Athenagoras I

Upon his arrival at Istanbul on January 27, the Patriarch Athenagoras I was met by his Bishops, the Orthodox delegations, and representatives of the Turkish Government. The following day the Greek Ambassador and the Consular Corps of Istanbul attended the ceremony of enthronement, but neither the Soviet Consul General nor any Consul of the Soviet bloc appeared, although they had escorted the former Patriarch on various occasions. Apparently, the more the Americans were helpful to the new Patriarch, the colder the Russians became. Dr. S. Bolshakoff remarks that this aloofness is unwarranted and communicates the following statement:

"On the request of the competent Greek Orthodox authority we are able to state that information concerning the resignation of the former Ecumenical Patriarch Maximos and the election of the new one, which appeared in the Turkish press last summer and was reproduced in the *Bulletin* afterwards, is incorrect. There is no foundation whatsoever in assertions that the former Patriarch was forced to resign because of his alleged Leftist views, and submitted only after a strong resistance. The late Patriarch resigned on account of his nervous illness which is hereditary in his family, because after all kinds of treatment his health did not improve. It is also denied that the new Patriarch was elected on pressure from the Right, anxious to find a leader to resist Soviet influence in the East. The new Patriarch intends to keep aloof from power politics. And he does not want to be hostile to the Patriarchate of Moscow. He intends to continue the same policy as his predecessor did. The Turkish journalists' statements were incorrect because mal-informed."

Near East

Latin-Rite Missions in Trans-Jordan

There are many Latin-rite missions conducted by the Latrin Patriarchate of Jerusalem in the little known Arabian kingdom of Transjordan. Recent figures show 18 Latin-rite missions, served by 21 diocesan priests who care for 8,683 faithful. They receive aid through the Franciscan Custody of the Holy Land from the world-wide Good Friday Collection. Depending upon these missions are 33 schools, taught by 100 teachers, of whom 35 are native Arab Sisters of the Rosary. The schools have an enrollment of 3,470 children, of whom 3,065 are Christians and 405 Moslems. These statistics are exclusive of the newly opened Terra Sancta College conducted by the Holy Land Custody which numbers 120 students, about equally divided between Catholics and various rites, separated Orientals and Moslems. Since 1932 there has been a Melkite rite Archbishop in charge of numerous churches and missions scattered throughout the semi-desert portions of Transjordan.

The Franciscan Custody of the Holy Land has recently opened a new Seraphic College, or preparatory seminary, at Araia, near Aley, in the mountains overlooking Beirut. It has the character of a refugee college since it is educating 30 postulants for the Franciscan Order who have been forced to abandon their former school at Emmaus in Palestine.

* * * *

ETHIOPIA

Ethiopian Church Gains Right to Native Archbishop

A recent agreement puts an end to a dispute which had threatened to divide the dissident Ethiopian and Coptic Churches. From the time of the Greek Frumentius, in 345 A.D., the Archbishop of the Ethiopian Church has always been an Egyptian appointed by the Patriarchate of Alexandria. In 1942 the Ethiopian Church began negotiations for the right to elect an Ethiopian Archbishop with the power to consecrate Ethiopian bishops. The Egyptian Patriarchate made counter proposals, and now, according to an announcement made by the Addis Ababa ecclesiastical authorities, a compromise has been reached. The Egyptian-born Archbishop Cyril will retain the nominal title of Archbishop of the Ethiopian Church until his death, but will remain in Alexandria, where he will continue to receive payment from Ethiopia. In the meantime, the acting head of the Ethiopian Church in Addis Ababa will be the newly consecrated Abuna (Bishop) Basilios, who will likewise retain his former position as Ichege (administrative head) of the Church. The churchmen of Addis Ababa feel that this agreement of "great historical and religious significance" brings them a large measure of autonomy in internal affairs even though their Church remains under the jurisdiction of the Coptic Church in Egypt. (EPS)

* * * *

ERITREA:

Ordination of Indigenous Clerics

For the second time the Capuchin Fathers of the Vicariate Apostolic

have ordained indigenous clerics. In February a young Cunamite from a pagan tribe in Bassopiano, Fr. Sebastian of Ghega, O.F.M.Cap., and Fr. Angelico of Assetah, of Ethiopian origin, were ordained to the Priesthood. About the same time, His Excellency Chidane' Maryam Cassa', Ordinary for Catholics of Alexandrine Ethiopian Rite, ordained two Seminarists who had come to the Catholic Church from the separated Church. The new priests have left for Ethiopia where their obedience calls them to begin their sacerdotal ministry.

India

A Correspondence Course for High Caste Indians

The high caste Indians present very special problems, and have been somewhat neglected by the apostolate. The Rev. Peter J. Sontag, S.J., has made special efforts to approach that influential class. From long experience he became convinced that many conformed to the externals of Hinduism because of custom, although education had dispelled their conviction, and that they tended toward agnosticism.

Father Sontag devised a correspondence course in the teachings of the Church under the name of Institute of Home Study which consisted in 20 lessons, with a page of questions accompanying each lesson. This page was answered by the student and returned for corrections. Personal contact was out of the question since a visit by a priest would jeopardize their social standing. The Institute used a post office box as its address.

Father Sontag secured a thousand names from bishops, priests and sisters, and sent out the first lesson to which a very few replied. Within a year, however, 500 persons began to return the question pages with praise for the course, often from individuals of very high standing. Some send names of other non-Christians. (NCWC)

Japan

Village of Repatriates Will Enter Church in a Group

Thirty families, numbering more than 60 persons, repatriated from Manchuria, China, and the Philippines have formed a colony near the village of Fukusomura, in the region of Fukuyama. Belonging to various sects—Buddhism, Shintoism and Protestantism—they found they had one thing in common: they had all seen the Catholic Church at work. They felt they had fight enough in scraping a living out of the earth without differing between themselves on religion. Whereupon, they decided unanimously that the best thing would be to join the Catholic Church in a body.

A Protestant teacher among them was delegated to communicate their decision to the Rev. Francis A. Reuschel, S.J., pastor of Fukuyama. The priest visited them, found them in earnest, and decided to give them instructions every Wednesday. They are making remarkably good progress, and it is expected that they will all be baptized before the end of the year.

Father Reuschel is likewise directing a study club of pagan Japanese. Communistic propaganda had aroused a group of several students to examine the Catholic faith. They organized a study club and within six months the membership grew to about twenty, including students, physicians and office workers. The group is now planning to build a small church.

Huge convert classes, unheard of before the war are being conducted in various parts of Japan. 120 converts in Okayama alone are reported for 1948. (NCWC)

China

Missionaries Remain in Communist-held Areas

Great numbers of Catholic missionaries remain within the Communist-dominated parts of China. Reports from the Red territories are varied and confused. It may be ascertained that in fact a certain reserved toleration of Catholic institutions exists in some parts, while in others brutal outrages are committed and the Communistic policy of full extermination proceeds. One may expect, however, the usual Communistic policy of leniency in those parts where Communism is not yet well established and total rigor where they find themselves completely in possession of power. It is known, in fact, that the Moscow trained Mao-tse-Tung has proclaimed this procedure.

The Catholic authorities have counseled all those who have the charge of souls to remain in their posts. They advise women religious when possible, the young and the sick, to depart from threatened areas, and seminarians are directed to leave for a safe place to continue their studies in preparation for the future. The Propaganda Fide offices at Rome have received communications from many religious institutions, including those of sisters, that they intend to remain, no matter what it costs. The example is given of one missionary who says that he had felt compelled to abandon his post twice on former occasions. After each return it had cost him about two years' labor to regain the confidence of the people. He has supplicated his superior to permit him to remain during this present menace.

Priests in Red China have been granted a special privilege from the Holy Father to celebrate Holy Mass with ordinary bread, without altar or candles, and without Missal or liturgical vestments. The Mass is that of Requiem, or the Votive Mass of Our Lady. Thus the Holy Sacrifice may be celebrated by a Priest surrounded by the faithful at table as if at a meal.

Communists have already taken over control of administration in the University of Peking, and it is expected that they plan to sieze the property ultimately. The threat to Catholic seats of learning is grave since intellectuals enjoy great influence in China.

Translation of the New Testament

Dr. John C. H. Wu, Chinese Minister to the Holy See, has received a letter of congratulation from His Holiness Pius XII on the completion of his translation of the New Testament into Chinese. The major portion of the work was done during the war with Japan from 1942 until 1945. Since coming to Rome in 1947 as Minister he has done considerable research and has had the opportunity of consulting experts of the Biblical Institute for criticism and revision. Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, although not a Catholic, collaborated in this work, contributing valuable suggestions and criticisms. The Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith has given official approval to the translation. The Nihil Obstat was given by the late Chinese Abbot Lou of the Monastery of St. André, Belgium. Archbishop Paul Yu Pin has given the Imprimatur. Dr. Wu, who entered the Church in 1937, has served as a member of the Legislative Yuan, as vice-president of the Commission for the preparation of the Chinese Constitution put into force in 1947, and as president of the Committee for Foreign Affairs of the Yuan. He attended the San Francisco Conference of 1945 as personal representative of Generalissimo Chiang. (NCWC)

Korea

Korean Ambassador to U. S. Sees Bright Future for Church

A constitutional guarantee of religious freedom along with the friendliness of the President of the Republic assures the Catholic Church a bright future in Korea, says Dr. John M. Chang, a leading Korean Catholic who has been appointed as Ambassador to the United States. He reports that Dr. Rhee, the President, is a convert to Christianity who has served as a Methodist missionary. He is a close friend of His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, and Msgr. Patrick J. Byrne, M.M., Apostolic Visitator in Korea. He regards the Catholic Church as a principal bulwark against Communism. Dr. Chang finds that the greatest hindrance to the growth of the Church in Korea is an inadequate educational system. The 300,000 Catholics have practically no institutions of higher education. The Korean Church is also pitiably lacking in social welfare institutions.

Book Reviews

THREE CONFERENCES OF KARL ADAM

(Commentary based on three conferences given at Stuttgart and Karlsruhe in 1947 as published in Una Sancta in Katholischer Sicht. Drei Vortrage uber die Frage einer Widervereinigung de getrennten christlichen Bekenntnisse, Patmos Verlag, Dusseldorf, 1948, 8°, pp. 114.)

Karl Adam Explains Luther's Relation to Lutheranism

Father Karl Adam is a master of scientific conferences. He is able to bring together a multitude of facts from many parts, and then dispose them in such ingenious and irresistibly attractive order that they plunge ahead, drawing both them and his hearers or readers to his own conclusions. The conferences which he held at Stuttgart and at Karlsruhe in 1947 on the problem of the return of Protestants to the unity of the Catholic Church became what one might call a notable event. In any case, they merit the most attentive consideration of both Catholics and Protestants, especially in those lands where both one and the other are numerous.

The first conference had as its purpose an explanation of Luther's rise to prominence. It is not this one, though, which pleases me most. The lecturer wished, as many before him, to show the need of reform in which the Church labored at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Certainly the need was great. Still one can exaggerate, especially if he neglects, or as is here the case, gives little emphasis to the reforming forces already at work within the Church itself. The history of the Church is not the history of a work which failed. If one gives too great consideration to the wretchedness of each century, he risks blinding himself to the marvellous fruits of conversion and of sanctification that the Church multiplies in her advance across the whole series of periods. What Karl Adam says of Gregory VII (p. 14) does not accord with the greatness of a Pontiff who has been enshrined above our altars because of his love of justice. This failing, which we may not allow to pass unnoticed, is nevertheless greatly attenuated by two remarkable observations of the author. As a matter of fact, the first is found in the second conference (pp. 39 ff).

The observation is made that the doctrine of Luther was already entirely formed when the quarrel over indulgences arose. It had, indeed, not been devised to reform the Church and bring it back to abandoned truths, but to satisfy the subjective needs of a conscience tormented by the memory of sin and the terror of God's judgments. This doctrine, which was to become the basis of Protestantism, was not bound logically to the disorders of the times, but it did find in them a favorable atmosphere for its diffusion. The other observation is made on a deeply pathetic page. The lecturer says in substance that if Luther, instead of revolting against the universal Church and violently tearing the tunic of Christ, had placed the power of his word, his strong will, his courage, and his capacity for enthusiasm in the service of a reform to be

carried out in the interior of the Church and in obedience to established authority, he would be today venerated in Germany and throughout the world as an equal of the greatest servants of the Faith, and perhaps of the greatest saints. Alas, he chose another route! (pp. 32-33)

Karl Adam studies the profound causes of the subjective order which brought the Augustinian monk to become the founder of Protestantism. On the one hand, Luther was tortured by the thought of sin which he saw even where it was not, and by the fear of an inexorable God. Insomuch, he was prepared to accept enthusiastically a doctrine which would reassure him and liberate him. On the other hand, his theology, that of Occam, did not dispose him to place in man any reality of such a nature as to promise salvation. Suddenly then, an interpretation of St. Paul flashed upon his mind which seemed to clarify everything and put all things at rest: God's justice is manifested in the Gospel in the sense that His justice takes the place of ours. Sinners we are and sinners we remain, but Christ is just and he merited that His justice be imputed to us. He who believes this possesses Christian liberty; he is delivered from the tyranny of the Law and from the terror of divine chastisement. Luther clung to this doctrine of extrinsic justice and salvation through faith alone like a ship-wrecked man to his raft. The new gospel was not a calm light which appeared at the end of critical reflection. It was an explosion produced by the clash of sentiments warring in Luther's soul. (Cf. p. 52) The conflict between this faith and that of the Church was inevitable. It burst forth in the indulgence dispute. It spread rapidly because it was favored by the political and religious conditions of those sad years. Within a short time, Luther found himself the head of a vast revolt against the Church and against the Pope, and the great separation was accomplished.

"Should it last forever?" the lecturer asks. He seeks in these pages—keenly interesting, but it seems to us too indulgent toward Luther—to show as Luther himself had done, that this work of the reformer allowed the hope of a reconciliation. I summarize the passage of Karl Adam (pp. 54 ff). He says that to the extent to which the crisis is caused by the subjective element, one may suppose the possibility of agreement on fundamental points with the cessation of that element. Luther himself would have been able, as many others do, to have found peace in the most certain Catholic doctrine. He did not give to free interpretation the scope that was later accorded it. He preserved principles which were capable of leading back to Catholicism: absolute authority of dogma, the presence of Christ in ecclesiastical worship, the hierarchy of the Church. He maintained belief in the central dogmas; namely, the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Redemption, Baptism, Penance, the Eucharist, and the Last Things. The Confession of Augsburg did not pretend to correct anything but certain abuses in Catholic doctrine. That which was specifically Protestant, justification by faith alone, signified the rejection of Occam's Pelagian tenden-

cies rather than the rejection of true Catholic thought. Abolition of the Mass is explained rather as a reaction against certain doctrinal deformations or practices than as real opposition to ideas which were later to be stated by the Council of Trent. The notion of a sacrament was still maintained, and through it the necessity of the priesthood could have been recognized once again. In fine, Luther's thought was that of the Catholics on many points.

For my part, I believe that Karl Adam has on more than one point exaggerated the Catholicism which Luther preserved. Yet, one may admit with him that the breach was widened after him. It was widened by the late sixteenth century Protestant theologians and by those of the seventeenth who wished to make the greatest possible opposition to the Catholics. A return of the Protestants to Luther would draw them closer to Rome. Karl Adam thinks moreover that the breach was further widened by the Catholic theologians who from their side wished to manifest their distance from Protestantism. One may certainly admit that the necessities of controversy caused them to defend principally, and to place in the greatest possible relief, the points of doctrine which were menaced by the new heresy.

Whatever the case, and however close it might bring the Protestants to us, I doubt whether a return to Luther would be an easy or even a possible thing for them. There is logic in doctrines. When the conclusions have been drawn from them, who can abandon them while retaining their premises? It seems that the Protestant opposition to Marian devotion, to intrinsic and permanent grace, the Tridentine notion of the sacraments, and many other Catholic teachings really derives its origin from some principle taught by Luther whose consequences were only later brought to light. The history of Protestantism is also the history of a development.

This second conference concludes with a very just remark. The Protestants of the Reform who have kept their faith in the Incarnate Word naturally travel the way of submission to the Will of Christ. May they examine closely the Scriptures, may they search there for the will of Jesus concerning His Church and the successor of Peter. May history teach them to recognize the necessity of a visible and audible authority to protect the unity which the Savior willed.

A practical question is treated in the third conference: How is union to be realized? The most fundamental difference existing between the Catholic and the Protestant is that the former looks upon the Church's authority as that of Christ, while the latter maintains his free interpretation in regard to the Church. Furthermore, for the Catholic Church, no other union is possible excepting a return of the dissident groups to its midst (p. 105) This by no means implies that Catholics have never been in the wrong, nor that the Protestants are without authentic religious values. Karl Adam proceeds to enumerate the conditions of union, and thereby furthers a clarification of the situation—although some Protestants deem him premature (Heinz

Flugel, *La nostalgie de l'Eglise dans le protestantisme allemand.* Documents 2, Feb. 1949, p. 181).

He insists upon the necessity of permitting oneself to be moved by reasons of the religious order alone. Common love of Christ is that which should act to diminish the distance between believers. One may expect easy agreement on those things which have to do with mere discipline. The lecturer presents excellent considerations for bringing about a comprehension of the Church's definitions such as that now awaited on the Assumption of Mary, and for defending the forms of Catholic piety. The legends of the apocryphal writers did not develop Catholic Mariology, but rather the spontaneous Mariology of the Christian spirit produced the legends which Mariology can do without. As regards the litanies and the prolonged recitation of the same formulas, these serve merely as the sustaining accompaniment to an inner prayer which is often intense and ardent.

The longing for union has now become universal. Despite this, and despite the reasons and the possibilities of union developed in the three conferences, Karl Adam believes that we may not yet expect meetings of community with community, but only of person with person. Sadly enough, one is obliged to share this opinion with him. Yet, if Catholics will multiply appeals as illuminating and as sympathetic as those of Karl Adam, we will doubtless see individuals returning in great numbers. These, so we may hope, would draw groups of ever increasing importance in their wake.

—Charles Boyer, S.J.

* * * *

La Chiesa Anglicana. By Joseph Gill, S. J., Milano, Instituto Galileo, 1948. xi + 142 pp.

For those who have always been Catholics the Anglican Church is one of the most puzzling phenomena in all Christendom. A church which professes to be both Catholic and Protestant; which prides itself on its "comprehensiveness," tolerating from its official ministers and teachers opposite and contradictory teaching on the most fundamental doctrines of Christian belief,—how explain it? how explain its continued life? The Anglican Church is today profoundly stirred by the passion for Christian reunion, more so than at any time in its history; probably more so than any other Christian body outside the Catholic Church. It has officially proclaimed that there can be no true reunion which "does not include the great Latin Church of the West." Many thousands of Anglicans have their eyes especially turned towards the Catholic Church, and already accept and profess almost the whole of the Catholic faith. How are we to help them to their goal? By prayer, of course, first. But in our intercourse with them, either personal or by writing, a first necessity is accurate knowledge, of their church and its history, of their minds,

their problems, and their difficulties. And our interest must be sympathetic and kindly. One must make friends with men before one can win them. And to make friends, intelligent and sympathetic understanding is necessary. We do not know any other book which so well provides a Catholic reader with the facts as does this small book by Father Gill.

The first half is a brief history of Anglicanism, from the Tudor schism to today. The second half is a survey of Anglicanism today; its doctrinal position, its worship, its organization, its relations with other churches, its efforts in the direction of Christian reunion. Father Gill writes at once with perfect impartiality and with sympathy and understanding,—understanding very unusual in one who has never lived within the Anglican fold. Catholic readers,—especially continental Catholic readers,—will find much of interest in the chapter on worship and organization, and particularly where Father Gill tells (pp. 125-6) of the extraordinary revival of the Religious Life in Anglicanism.

This revival, and the revival of Catholic worship and devotion, are fruits of the Oxford Movement. We know of nothing even remotely approaching them in other Christian bodies outside the Catholic Church. The author says that without the Oxford Movement the Anglican Church might not have survived. And this Movement and revival have Rome as their goal, consciously with many, unconsciously with many more. In fact, before the Oxford Movement, ever since the schism, there have never lacked Anglicans who looked longingly towards Rome, the source of their religion. On pages 54-5 Father Gill speaks of the great Anglican theologians of the seventeenth century,—the "Caroline Divines." One of the greatest and most learned of them, Thorndile, wrote: "I am confident that no church can separate from Rome but must make themselves schismatics before God. . . . I insist on such a principle as may serve to reunite us with Rome, being well assured that we never can be well united with ourselves otherwise, and that not only the Reformation, but our common Christianity will be lost in the divisions which will never have an end otherwise." Could anyone better prophesy the tragic chaos of non-Catholic Christendom today?

We hope that an English version of this valuable little book may be published.

—H. K. Pierce.